

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER

APRIL, 1844.

Travels in New Zealand, with Contributions to the Geography, Geology, Botany, and Natural History of that Country. By ERNEST DIEFFENBACH, M.D., late Naturalist to the New Zealand Company. London: J. Murray. 1843.

Letters from Settlers and Labouring Emigrants in the New-Zealand Company's Settlements of Wellington, Nelson, and New Plymouth, from February, 1842, to January, 1843. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1843.

Letters from the Bishop of New Zealand to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, with other Information concerning his Diocese. London: Rivingtons. 1843.

Colonization of New Zealand. Translated from the German of Professor CHARLES RITTER, of Berlin. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1843.

Fisher's Colonial Magazine and Commercial Maritime Journal for December, 1843.

CONSIDERING that the five books which we have placed at the head of this our second article on colonial emigration are about one tithe of the works, from twenty-shilling octavos to shilling or six-penny pamphlets already published concerning New Zealand, we hardly require the excuse of late events for thus performing the promise we gave in our article on the resources of Australia. The late unfortunate occurrences at Nelson have tended to increase the interest gradually rising among us regarding our last of colonies, and every letter from that island has been the fruitful source of comment in our daily and periodical literature, and anxious conversation among those who are already connected with New Zealand through their relatives or friends, or are thinking of seeking their subsistence on the soil of that fertile colony. With every prospect, therefore, of

commanding more attention for our lucubrations than would otherwise, perhaps, have fallen to their lot, we proceed to draw out with some minuteness the biography of New Zealand—the life, fortunes, resources, and future prospects of the youngest of our colonial settlements.

Modern colonists act on two principles in the selection of their adopted country: one party make up their minds to contend with a climate uncongenial to their habits and constitution, for the sake of the commercial products to be raised under its influence when directed by their energies or their capital, becoming by degrees the masters of a numerous native race, unable to contend with them, and raising rather factories than colonies. The other class seek out a country as nearly like their own as nature offers, and where the physical and intellectual energies of themselves and their descendants may be matured, and where, from resources within the colony itself, there is a fair, if not a certain, prospect of a steady progress to ultimate prosperity, and of, at the same time, relieving their own wants, and benefiting, by increased demand, the mother-country. Such a country is New Zealand. The climate is not only analogous to that of England, but as mild as that of her southern counties, and yet healthy and invigorating. Here is no epidemic to wither health and strength; no drought to devastate the flocks and herds, and desiccate the pastures. The greater part of the country possesses a soil suitable to the production of grain, fruit, and vegetables, so necessary for European colonists; whilst its forests present materials for the ship-builder, and its freestone and marble are ready to the mason's hand. It wants not in coal to call into life the power of steam, or in harbours or inlets to facilitate intercourse and trade. Those who resort to our Australian colonies with the expectation of making fortunes easily and rapidly, had better not seek New Zealand. They will not there find the endless pasture-grounds of New South Wales or Van Diemen's Land, or sufficient available native labour to produce, in the shortest possible time, articles of export. Such colonists as these, who regard the new land merely as a temporary resting-place, will not progress in that island; but to all those who come to a colony as to a second home, content to form one item in an independent and affluent middle class, such as the old English yeoman was, and in some places still is; who are content to labour long and well, so that their labour do but meet with its reward at last; who come to a colony to seek and to find there, not instant wealth, but eventual independence, after years of successful labour, to them New Zealand presents more advantages than any other colony; *it is peculiarly the yeoman's colony.*

The name of New Zealand has been given to a group of islands, consisting of two large and several smaller ones, lying in a line, situated in the southern hemisphere, and the antipodes of our own island in longitude, the meridian of Falmouth passing through the

strait that divides the two great islands of New Zealand. It is not so in its latitude, as the most southern point of the New Zealand group is three degrees farther from the ant-arctic than the Lizard is from the arctic pole, whilst the most northern promontory of the great northern isle corresponds within thirty miles with the most southern cape of the island of Candia. To the most northern of the group, or, as it is now called, North Island or New Ulster, the natives have given the dreadful looking name of Eaheinomauwe; whilst to the great middle island, or New Munster of the colonists, the equally euphonious name of Tavai-Poenammoo has been attached by the aborigines. Stewart's Island, which is immediately to the south of the middle isle, and is of very trifling dimensions, is now called New Leinster, or the South Isle, Foveaux' Strait dividing it from Munster, as Cook's Strait separates that isle from the great northern one.

Our claim to the sovereignty of New Zealand, as against any other European nation, dates from the visit of the navigator, Cook, who spent nearly six months on its coasts, surveyed them with considerable care and accuracy, and proclaimed the rule of George III. over the islands in the years 1769 and 1770. Previous to that time, however, the islands had been seen, though not landed upon, or surveyed, by the Dutchman, Tasman, who entered Cook's Straits from the west, came into contact with the natives as soon as he anchored, and, after a severe loss, sailed away along the west coast of the northern island, fully persuaded, as every one was until Cook's survey, that he was coasting a portion of the Australian continent. Tasman's visit was nearly a century earlier (1642) than that of Cook; and it is supposed, and with some slight show of reason, that, in the previous century to his visit, the Spaniards had sighted, though not visited, the New Zealand group. Three years after Cook's visit, the French navigator, Marion, visited these islands, and fell in a quarrel between his men and the natives; and, in 1791, Vancouver came thither, and from that time may be dated a constant intercourse between New South Wales and the New Zealand isles. By degrees the whaling ships began to resort to the Bay of Islands, in the north-eastern corner of the northern island, for fresh provisions, commencing a most baneful connexion with the natives of the district, and by degrees forming a settlement of the most abandoned characters—the runaways from New South Wales—who lived in unfettered licence, and exercised a complete tyranny over the aborigines, until the former was partially repressed by the missionaries under Mr. Marsden, and the latter in a manner regulated by the appointment of magistrates for the district, by the Governor of New South Wales, in the year 1814.

The missionaries, backed by the powerful resources of the Church Missionary Society, and the influence exercised with the government by its leading members, very soon became the *de facto* governors of the island, and resisted every attempt at colonization

by our own or any other nation. Not content with all but absolute sway over the northern island, where their own settlements were situated, the missionaries seem to have collected together a few chiefs in the neighbourhood of the Bay of Islands, and persuaded them to declare themselves lords of the Great Middle Island, on which they had never so much as landed, and with the natives of which they had never as yet come in contact. In return for the suggested claim, the missionaries received liberal grants of land, not only in the one, but both islands, so situated as to extend their own sway of the island, and effectually hinder any future colonization, except greatly to the profit of the recipients of the present enormous grants. The north shore of the Tamaki, to the extent of ninety square miles, is claimed by one of the missionaries as a native grant, and already eleven gifted individuals have put in their claims to nearly an hundred thousand acres of the most available land in the islands. In these claims the Church missionaries were fairly matched by their rivals of the Wesleyan connexion.

As far back as the end of the last century the whale-fishery of New Holland was successfully prosecuted off the shores of New Zealand, and, from the great success of the fishery, and the cheap supply of provisions, the Bay of Islands has for years been the favourite resort of those engaged in that trade. About the same time, too, the New Zealand flax began to be looked upon as a useful article, and vessels came to the islands to take in cargoes of that plant, from the western shores of the North Island, whence the principal supply was obtainable; and the rise of the flax-trade called into existence small settlements on the western shores, as that of whaling had on the eastern. Seal-fishing was, during the first twenty years of this century, successfully prosecuted on both coasts, and afterwards removed to Cook's Straits, as the supply began to decrease, thus giving rise to settlements on the southern shore of the North Island, where the whale was recklessly destroyed on its breeding-grounds.

Between the white colonists and the missionaries there was little congeniality of opinion, save in condemning and despising the fallacy of the native government, of which the lay secretary of the Church Missionary Society was the chief protector and guardian. Obedience to the missionaries the new settlers would not pay, whilst the native chiefs could not command either party; and the consul who was sent by the English government in 1833, was by no means able to manage the very queer people placed under his protection. In 1830 La Place, the distinguished French navigator, came to the Bay of Islands, and met with little civility from the missionaries. This conduct on their part was due doubtless as much to their unthinking hatred of every Romanist, as to their fears lest the French should assume that sovereignty over the islands which the English government still refused to exercise. It is sad to think that any ministers of Christianity should have so acted as to warrant La Place in publicly declaring, in his official report, that "the

English missionaries at the Bay of Islands exhibit neither the charity, which all the ministers of religion profess, nor the generosity for which their countrymen are remarkable towards strangers. My offers and my solicitations to obtain from them some refreshment for our sick were alike in vain; and I am convinced myself that, suspecting me of political purposes, they endeavoured to disturb the harmony that existed between me and the natives, by insinuating to them that I meant to take possession of the bay, and revenge the massacre of Marrion." Two years after La Place's visit, the declaration of Baron de Thierry, that he was about to assume the sovereignty of New Zealand, and establish an independent kingdom in that and the Marquesa's Islands, excited considerable anxiety among the European settlers, and a united petition was presented in the following year to William the Fourth, stating the incapacity of the native rulers, and soliciting the English crown to assume the sovereignty over the islands. So lawless was the state of society at that time, that the missionaries themselves united in soliciting such a government as would secure peace and tranquillity, even at the expense of their own power. Not so, however, the home societies; the project suited neither Mr. Dandeson Coates nor his Wesleyan coadjutors. The one was determined to resist any interposition of British sovereignty, the others "steadily to maintain those principles by which they had been actuated in resisting the proposed scheme for the colonization of New Zealand." Three years after this petition, which was, thanks to manœuvring, ineffectual, the New Zealand Society arose, and commenced the first systematic colonization of the northern island, choosing Cook's Straits as the place of their operations, whither they sent their first ship load of emigrants in 1839. Things now got too bad to last long without a good government, and in 1840, Captain Hobson was sent out as the first governor of New Zealand, under the late assumed sovereignty of the isles; and, after some bungling and delay, the government colony and seat of authority was fixed on the south shore of the Waitemata bay, at the bottom of the great inlet of Houraki in the northern island. Since then, many a good and sharp squabble has there been between the favourers of the government colony and the patrons of the New Zealand Company's lands, as to which are best suited for colonists.* With these disputes we have little to do; let the pamphleteers on both sides fight it out: all we propose doing is giving the best description we can of the several settlements on the island, and letting those who read decide. Since then, a new governor, Captain Fitzroy, has gone out, and seems to find favour with all parties. Dr. Selwyn has become the first bishop, and with what effect our copious extracts from his most interesting letters to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel will best declare.

* While these pages are passing through the press, we learn from an advertisement in the daily papers, that the contest between the Colonial Office and the New Zealand Company has come to a crisis; one apparently disastrous to the latter institution. It is on the eve of total disruption.

The bishop arrived in his diocese in May, 1842, and before the close of that year had completed his first visitation of every important settlement in the islands. Wherever there is a bank he has established a church fund for the erection of schools and clergymen's houses, to which he devotes surplice and other fees, and the proceeds of the offertory. In his letter, written at sea, immediately after the conclusion of his first visitation, he says,—

"From the nature of the country of New Zealand, the population is likely to be divided into a number of villages; a distribution likely to be favourable to morality, but adding to the difficulty of providing the people with adequate pastoral superintendence. At the same time, I find in all the settlements a very considerable willingness on the part of the inhabitants to bear their part in the maintenance of ministers, and hope, therefore, to be enabled, by the assistance of the Society, to go on from year to year endowing the church in perpetuity in the new settlements as fast as they arise. Of course, at first, the glebe lands will yield little or nothing; and I shall be obliged to divide the sum which the Society may be enabled to allow me for annual salaries of clergymen among the ministers, who may be expected to increase in number, and, therefore, must gradually become less and less dependent upon the allowance of the Society. This diminution of their dividend of the Society's grant, may be met by the increase of the Local Church Fund, arising from the rental of lands, and the contributions of the congregations."—P. 7.

The northern island has already been apportioned into four arch-deaconries, and a small college for candidates for orders established at the Waimate, conducted by the bishop himself and his chaplains. Another arch-deaconry is designed for the district of Nelson and the northern part of the middle island. In compliance with the urgent request of the governor and people of Auckland, a school is about to be formed there in connexion with the collegiate institution already spoken of. Every town clergyman is required by the bishop to learn the native language, and to regard the aborigines as his flock quite as much as the European settlers; "and," adds Bp. Selwyn, "I find it will be necessary also to establish the converse rule, that every missionary to the natives shall also be ready to minister to the English settlers; for in this country English and natives will live side by side, unless some rupture (which God avert!) should take place between them." None can peruse Dr. Dieffenbach's journeys, not merely round the coast and the partially-civilized districts, but over every portion of the northern isle, and not feel assured that in every rupture the fault will be mainly on the side of the colonists. That traveller met not only with peace and an absence of annoyance, but each chief seemed to vie with the other in showing their kindness towards him and his small party. Every fresh account will show that the late fatal rupture at Nelson was due to the indiscretion of our own people.

The following extracts from the Bishop's letters must prove interesting to every one who cares aught for our new colony:—

"In every part of the country I find great occasion for thankfulness and hope. Of course little has been done as yet; but the comfort is, that very few hindrances have grown up to prevent the establishment of a sound and efficient

Church system. May God give us grace to use with earnestness and understanding the peculiar advantages which are placed within our reach. We have not to combat with a host of full-grown difficulties, such as usually stand in the way of the ministers of religion when they come late in the day into ground already pre-occupied. Thank God we are foremost in the field, and may prevent, I trust, much opposition, which otherwise would have been most injurious to the interests of religion hereafter.

"My friend Mr. Chief Justice Martin and myself, feel that in the line of our new duties, a door of great and effectual usefulness is open to us. We have been appointed joint Trustees, with the chief Protector of the Aborigines as our colleague, of the lands and funds reserved for the benefit of the native race; a trust of immense importance, both as regards the magnitude of the property, and still more the high moral and spiritual interests which it involves. The native Reserves amount in land to between thirty and forty thousand acres; and the money fund, to fifteen per cent. upon the produce of all land sales effected by the government. The moral and spiritual considerations involve the earnest endeavour to advance seventy or eighty thousand of the most intelligent people in the world in the knowledge of true religion, and in the scale of social existence.

"I speak of the natives first, because they are the great bulk of the population; and, I think, the hinge upon which the prosperity of the colony will turn. But add to the Native Trust the necessity of providing every one of the English settlements with every one of its Ecclesiastical Institutions; for there is not so much as a Church of England School in any one of them; that the whole system has to be framed by the gradual addition of that 'which every joint supplieth'; that upon the soundness of the principles upon which this system is framed, depends, under God, much of the future character of the people of the country; and I confess I should tremble at my own insufficiency if the work did not display so manifestly the finger of God in all its parts, that I can look upon myself only as one portion of the clay, over which he has power, and which he is moulding evidently according to his will.

"But I have not yet concluded the sources of comfort which may be drawn from the effectual working of God's grace in this country; the care of the Church Mission by itself is an employment to which I should have been thankful to be allowed to devote my whole life. Taken as a whole, the missionary body more than equals my expectations. The great majority, too, of the Catechists whom I have seen, are men who, with few advantages of education, have been both faithful and successful in their exertions. As for the people, I love them from my heart, and my desire to serve them grows day by day; there is something so cheering in the frank and cordial openness of their countenance and manner, and in the blameless and devout tenor of their lives."—Pp. 9, 10.

The natives, when they parted with many of their lands to former and present settlers, never intended to dispose of them in the way in which they were purchased by the settlers. The complete ownership of the land the native never intended to part with; he merely proposed selling the right to use it, when not required by the tribe, and believed that he reserved to himself the fee of his ancestral land, and gave no power to the white man to remove him from the lands against his will. It is impossible here to enter into the very complex subject of the old purchases of lands from the natives, and the late contracts between the Company and the chiefs. One thing may be noticed, at once curious, and adding considerably to the present difficulties in adjusting equitably the various grants and claims of land, for the strict letter of the contract would be paramount injustice to the native. Many a tribe may inhabit and cultivate a district,

to all appearances the sole possessors, and that for many generations, and yet have no right in the land. This results sometimes from the permission of the superior tribe by whom the present possessors have been conquered, and comparatively left to cultivate at least a portion of their own territory, though the right in the soil has passed by conquest to the victorious tribe. Sometimes, when a tribe, hard pressed by enemies, has migrated, all but a small remnant, the few left behind retire to remote parts of their old territory, and without the knowledge of the superior tribe to which they properly have passed, and which has long since meted out every portion of the land among their own warriors, if they do but choose to take possession of it. Thus the real and apparent right to land is often in very different and very distant nations; and many a tribe has outwitted the colonists in disposing of lands vested in other tribes, and not in that which has so long inhabited and cultivated the soil.

Auckland, the seat of the government of the colony, and chief residence of the Bishop, lies about midway on the western shore of the northern island, or, as it is now called, New Ulster, at the bottom of the last of a succession of deep and wide bays, formed by the estuary of the Thames, and approachable from both the east and west coasts of the island. The temperature of Auckland is all that can be desired by an emigrant. During the summer months,—that is, from their October to March—the mean temperature is about sixty-seven degrees, whilst during the winter it seldom falls to freezing-point, and averages little less than fifty-two degrees of Fahrenheit. Comparing this settlement with that which corresponds with it in our northern hemisphere, namely, Montpellier, we find that though to both has been assigned a mean temperature of nearly sixty degrees, the difference between the mean temperature of summer and that of winter is, in Montpellier, as much as sixty-eight degrees; whilst in its antipodes, Auckland, it hardly reaches twenty degrees. By the equalizing influence of the insular position of New Zealand, and the proximity of Auckland to the coast, we are assured by Dr. Dieffenbach, that while the hottest month at Auckland corresponds with that at Vienna, the coldest is but little below that of the coldest in the capital of Portugal.

Passing northward from the embouchure of the Thames, we gradually lose the high lands peculiar to that district as we approach the large island of Waiheke, that lies off the entrance to the Bay of Waitemata, on the southern shore of which the government settlement is located. The harbour of Waitemata is the most important of that range of bays, which form the Gulf of Hauraki, separating as they nearly do the northern island into two parts, from the harbour of Port Coromandel on the eastern, to that of Manukao on the western side of New Ulster.

"In passing from the outlet of the Thames towards Waitemate," says Dr. Dieffenbach, "the aspect of the shores is highly picturesque. A luxuriant vegetation covers them to the water's edge, or alternates with the clearings made by the natives. As we approached Auckland, several regular volcanic

cones rose over the table-land, which stretches across the island to the harbour of Manukao. We passed a number of islands, of which that of Waikale is overtopped with stately Kauri-pines; from every crevice of the rocks on these islands, even where washed by the salt water, the glossy green of various shrubs meets our eyes. The islands in the Gulf of Hauraki, luxuriantly wooded as they are, and divided from each other by deep straits, afford a succession of ever-changing scenery, and give the region a variety which is unrivalled by any other harbour in New Zealand, in most of which steep and uniform surrounding hills shut in the view, and confine it to a narrow space.

"The navigable entrance into the harbour is only three-quarters of a mile wide, as it is narrowed by a reef, the outermost point of which is marked by a beacon, and is distant three-quarters of a mile from a curious bastion-shaped rock of sandstone, which may be regarded as the southern head. Within the heads the channel widens to an average breadth of one mile; it has its greatest depth on the northern shore, and is shallow on the southern, on which the town of Auckland has been laid out, about two miles and a half from the southern head. The depth of the harbour is from six to nine fathoms in mid-channel; and three to three and a half at the sides. The inlet continues about ten miles to the westward, sending an arm to the northward, towards the river Kaipara, and another towards the southward, towards the harbour of Manukao. The northern arm has a deep but very narrow channel near the northern shore; but shoals and rocks obstruct the passage leading towards Manukao, except for large boats, which can go up for several miles in the river-like inlet, and between its upper part and the harbour of Manukao, there is a portage of one mile and a half."—Vol. i. pp. 276—8.

There is not much wood in the immediate neighbourhood of Auckland, so fatal was the general conflagration by which nearly all the woods round the bay were destroyed, save a small strip of Kauri and other trees on the northern shore, the store-house of fire-wood and timber for the new settlement. Close to the town the land is first-rate, and likewise towards the harbour of the west coast, and also to the eastward,—“it is fit for all kinds of horticultural and agricultural purposes.” The demand for fire-wood, and the necessity of clearing the land, will soon remove the most attractive garment that nature has given to the sandstone cliffs of Waitemata; and as one by one the pohutukana trees fall before the emigrant's axe, the purple Christmas-flower garment of the bay becomes rent, and torn piece-meal. As in most places in New Zealand, Auckland is well supplied with water, both by the small water-runs in the valleys, and the springs that afford a ready supply on digging a few feet below the surface. Here, too, is solid material for building, hard scoriæ, at the base of the neighbouring volcanic cones, easily worked, and sandstone that hardens on exposure to the air. But a mile to the eastward lies the small bay of Oraki, so formed by nature as to present a natural dock, capable of application to every purpose connected with shipping, at a small expense. Again there is another passage to the western harbour of Manukao by the inlet of Taranaki, of six feet water at the entrance at low water, which deepens greatly within the bar, and vessels of two hundred tons can sail up some distance towards the head of the inlet, where a portage of a quarter of a mile divides it from the port of Manukao. The excellence of the land on both sides of the Tamaki has ere this attracted visitors;

and the north shore, besides other lands extending some ninety square miles, is claimed by a catechist of the Church Missionary Society, doubtless obtained for a very valuable consideration.

There is but one thing that will prevent Auckland from rising rapidly, that is the curse of new settlements,—land speculation. No place in New Zealand has such a combination of advantages. The agriculturist has land, good available land, close to the town; the merchant has everything he can require in the way of water-carriage, and situation for commercial purposes. If the emigrants will but cultivate their home resources, and apply themselves diligently to the coast trade which every day brings to them, and every day will continue to increase upon them, if they will but attend to it, no place in the northern island can be better situated for the site of the capital of the colony. The Bay of Waitemata is the natural harbour of the fertile districts of the valley of the Thames and the Piako; from thence, both northward and southward, communication is easy. When Dr. Dieffenbach was there, even then, with such insufficient communication as they had, an inland communication could be effected with the Bay of Islands in less than five days; whilst "with the western coast," says the same writer, "and with the interior, over Manukao and the river Waikato, nothing interrupts the water-communication but two small portages; and even with Cook's Straits, relations can be easily established, either by the river Thames, or the Waikato and Waipa, and the river Wanganui. In short, it appears to me that there can be no question but that the place has been very judiciously chosen for the site of a town, as commanding a great extent of available land in its neighbourhood, great facility of communication with the coast and the interior of the northern island, and as being a central point for the most powerful native tribes, the Nga-pui to the northward, the Waikato to the southward, and the Nga-te-hauwa to the eastward, separating them in a military point of view, but uniting them for the purposes of cultivation and commerce." Such is the verdict of one in a high degree capable of judging accurately, and not likely to let his judgment be biassed in favour of the locality, from the fact of Auckland not being a settlement of the Company whose surveyor he was. Here the bishop first landed, and the following interesting extract from his first letter gives us his month's experience of that portion of his new diocese:

Auckland, July 29, 1842.

"MY DEAR SIR,—You will have already heard, from other quarters, of my arrival in New Zealand; but I have hitherto delayed writing any official letters, that I might have time to verify my first impressions by more extended observation. I have now been two months in New Zealand, and from the first day of my landing until now, have seen, day after day, more and more reason to be thankful, on the part of the Church, for the establishment of the Bishopric of this colony, and for myself, that I am allowed to share in so great and hopeful a work. I find myself placed in a position such as was never granted to any English Bishop before, with a power to mould the institutions of the

Church from the beginning, according to true principles; and I earnestly desire the prayers of the Church at home, that I may be enabled clearly to discern that truth, and consistently to follow it.

"I landed first at Auckland on Monday, May 30, from the brig *Bristolian*, in which I had proceeded from Sydney, in consequence of an accident to the *Tomatin* at Sydney, which caused a delay of several weeks before the ship could be repaired. Auckland now contains a population of 1,900 persons, of which more than 1,100 are registered as members of the Church of England. The Rev. J. F. Churton, late chaplain at Wellington, has officiated here during the last year and a half. A brick church, in the early English style, which will contain about six hundred persons, is in progress; but from the great cost of materials and labour, the funds are at present inadequate for its completion. It is well placed on a commanding eminence in the centre of the town, and will form a striking object from the harbour. At present Divine Service is performed, by permission of the governor, in the court-house; where a very respectable congregation is assembled every Sunday. Mr. Churton also performs Divine Service at the barracks, and at the prison. He receives 200*l.* per annum from the government, to which I have added 100*l.* per annum from the annual grant voted me by the Society for stipends of clergymen. He has built a house for himself on an allotment which he purchased for that purpose.

"The governor, on my application, has vested in me as trustee two pieces of ground of eight acres each, 'for the burial of the dead, according to the usage of the Church of England,' allotting, at the same time, two similar plots to be divided among the other denominations of Christians. Our burial-grounds are about half a mile from the centre of the town, on the sides of two of the ridges which slope down gradually to the harbour, and conveniently situated at corresponding distances from the two churches. The first ground was consecrated on Sunday last, on which occasion I was assisted by the Rev. J. F. Churton, Rev. R. Cole (whom I propose to place at Wellington,) and Rev. R. Maunsell (one of the missionaries of the Church Missionary Society). Divine Service was performed in the church-tent presented to me by Mr. Cotton, which is completely fitted with communion-table and desks, and will contain three hundred persons. This will be of great use to me at Nelson and Wellington, where there are at present no places appropriated to public worship. In the event of the population of Auckland rapidly increasing, this burial-ground will form a beautiful site for another church. In the meantime, I intend to avail myself of the natural beauties of the spot, to give it such a character as will accord with the reverential feelings with which it will be visited by the friends and relatives of the dead who are there interred.

"The church now in progress is called the church of St. Paul; on the central one of the three ridges on which the town will stand. I have obtained another excellent site on the western ridge, on which I intend, as soon as possible, to build a wooden chapel, and to lay the foundation of a church on a grand scale, to be proceeded with gradually as funds can be obtained. On the third, *i. e.* the eastern ridge, nearest to the mouth of the harbour, and on a high ground commanding a view of the whole frith of the Thames, I have given directions for the purchase of twenty or thirty acres of land for a site for the cathedral, and for a cathedral close. By this arrangement I may hope to secure a future provision for every possible increase of population, as sites will be prepared for three churches in the main parts of the town; and when the houses extend half a mile into the country, the two burial-grounds will meet the wants of the people, by additions to the chapels which I intend to build upon them for the funeral services.

"I have obtained permission to select and purchase sites for parsonage-houses, contiguous to the churches and burial-grounds, which I shall endeavour to let upon building-leases, reserving one central piece of ground sufficient for the residence of all the clergy of the town, who may find it more desirable for

some years to come to live upon a collegiate plan, than to incur the expense of so many separate establishments.

"Any money that I may be able to spare from Auckland itself, will be required for the establishment of the Church in some of the suburban settlements, where villages are beginning to be formed. From one of these, Windsor, distant four miles from Auckland, I have already received an address expressive of the desire of the inhabitants for a church and clergyman, and their willingness to contribute."—Pp. 3—5.

Truly such a letter is encouraging, and makes us dream that we have fallen on better times. Compare this account of the progress of religious superintendence and comfort in this colony, to that sad tale we were obliged to set forth of the early foundation of Australia. True it is, and equally sad as well as true, that the failing of resources, temporary only we trust, may for a time mar the noble plans of the bishop, and for a time prevent the Gospel and the Services of the Church being made known to those who have left our land for the far colony, and the dark sons of the soil, on whose lands we are trespassing. Truly this is a sad thing to contemplate. But was it not far worse with Australia? It is bad enough to want the means to do good,—it is far worse to want the wish. Fear not, my Lord, the Church will not dare to leave her daughter a cripple and maimed in the far-off island, for the want of a little of this world's wealth. However governments may hold back, however officials may look cold, God will support and defend His own; He will speak through His Church, and act through His Church, and there shall be those who will give their wealth, and those who will devote their persons to the good and glorious work so well begun by the Church's true son.

Among the many smaller settlements that have risen and are daily rising on the coasts of the northern island, northward of its division by the bays of Hauraki, the most flourishing is that of Waimate, about sixteen miles to the north of Auckland on the western shore, and in the direct passage from the Bay of Islands to Hokianga harbour. The neighbourhood is far from being suited to agricultural purposes, abounding as it does in thermal, and other medicinal springs, and exhibiting in every direction extinct craters, and other marks of its volcanic nature. Waimate has a very European appearance, was early chosen as a station for one of the Church Missionary Society's clergymen, and is now, for the present, the favourite residence of the bishop, who gives the following description of this, the Bath and Cheltenham of New Zealand:

"Next door to our house, which is the college, is the collegiate-school, which has not yet been opened, but will probably be set on foot after Easter. The premises have hitherto been used as the missionary school, and are very complete for the purpose. The cathedral library is established at Kerikeri, ten miles from this place, in a fine stone building, partly used as a store. I have just completed the arrangements of the library, so that the goodly presents of my numerous friends are all accessible; and a beautiful sight they are. It is enough to cheer the heart to see such a body of sound divinity collected in this most distant of the dioceses of the Church of England. Add to this the private

feeling of knowing that every one of the books is the gift of some friend, whose heart and whose prayers are with us.

"One of the chief advantages of the Waimate is, that we have a spacious church close to the house. It is built entirely of wood, painted white, and gives a very English look to the village. In the interior we have a stone font, an altar cloth and cushions, a pulpit—and beautiful large books, all the gifts of different friends in England.

"Here I held my first confirmation, at which three hundred and twenty-five natives were confirmed. A more orderly, and I hope impressive, ceremony could not have been conducted in any church in England; the natives coming up in parties to the communion table, and audibly repeating the answer—*E wakaotia ana e ahau, 'I do (confess).'*" It was a most striking sight to see a church filled with native Christians, ready, at my first invitation, to obey the ordinances of their religion. On the following Sunday three hundred native communicants assembled at the Lord's table, though the rain was unceasing. Some of them came two days' journey for this purpose. My Windsor communion plate was used for the second time on this occasion. The natives were much pleased when they were told that it was a present from my congregation in England, and seemed to enter fully into the spirit of the gift."—*Pp. 12, 13.*

Many persons conclude, without consideration, that because some volcanic regions are peculiarly fertile, all must be so. They should consider that it all depends on the nature of the eruptions from the neighbouring craters. Forty or perhaps a less number of years, will render ejected mud or ashes ripe for vegetation, and fit for planting, as in the regions of Etna and Vesuvius: far different is the case when lava and scoræ are thrown out on the land, as in New Zealand. This has been the error in the selection of Waimate, as far as agriculture is concerned, however useful the settlement may become as a medicinal refuge, on account of the springs in its immediate vicinity. Dr. Dieffenbach, who visited them in December 1840, gives the following account of these springs:—

"A few miles to the southward of Waimate, are some curious thermal springs. In order to visit which, we leave Waimate and ascend a hill, from which three volcanic cones present themselves to our view, in an extensive depression of the table-land below. The plain is spread over with fragments, often more than fifteen feet in diameter, of a slate-coloured basaltic rock, the spaces between which are covered with fern and flax; while, here and there, are patches planted with Indian corn and potatoes. After passing a small native settlement, and crossing a ravine, we ascend a ridge of hills, very barren and steep, with a white clay on the surface, and evidently covered in former times with the kauri-pine. We now come to a lake, about one mile in circumference; on its shores are black and half-burnt stems of kauri, and the soil in the neighbourhood is covered with efflorations of pure sulphur. At a little distance is another lake, called Ko-huta-kino, smaller than the former; and near this are the mineral springs. There are several of them, all close to the lake. The first which I examined was strongly aluminous, and of a temperature of 62° Fahrenheit. A few feet from it was a tepid spring, of a milk-white colour and an alkaline taste; its temperature was 124°. A third was acidulous, with a temperature of 154°. In another, over which rose sulphuretted hydrogen gas, the thermometer stood at 133°, while the temperature of the surrounding air was 80°. A small creek discharged itself into the lake, through a narrow valley, the gaseous emanations of sulphuric acid have much altered the argillaceous rock, parts of which have become white and red, while in other portions it has changed into a species of clay, covered with sublimations of pure alum, sulphur, and different sulphates. There are several

other springs in the neighbourhood, which mix their waters with the creek, and impart to it an increased temperature."—Vol. i. pp. 245-6.

From the natives whom the doctor found living in temporary habitations round the springs, and the diseases with which they were afflicted, he was enabled to learn the traditional effects of the waters, in cutaneous and scrofulous affections. The uniform brown tint of the verdure in the vicinity, whilst it repels the healthful emigrant from wasting his labour or his money on the volcanic soil, assures him of an immediate and valuable remedy when attacked by many of the illnesses common in the islands.

No little controversy has been expended in discussing the relative merits of the Bay of Islands on the east, and Auckland on the west, shore, as situations for the capital of New Zealand. The number of vessels that for years resorted to the former, was always the standing argument of the Baymen; but, now that the increased arrivals of Europeans have gradually, but surely, raised the price of provisions at the Bay of Islands, the reason of their former resort becomes clear; and, as the latter locality is unable to offer the available land in its vicinity that Auckland possesses, or a bay out of its hundreds large enough to build a town in, except on the side of a steep hill, the contest seems ended in the victory of the Aucklanders.

Southward from Auckland, and almost in the centre of the northern island, is the great lake of Taupo, the lofty volcano of Tongariroo, and the boiling cascade of Rotu-Mahana—the three great curiosities of the island. The lake of Taupo will hereafter be of the utmost consequence, as the connecting link of water-communication between the settlements in Cook's Straits and those in the Bay of Hauraki. A glance at any tolerable map of the island shows the river Waikato that runs into the Thames, and thence into the Bay of Hauraki, springing from the northern side of the lake, whilst from the foot of Tongariroo, on the opposite shore, the Wanganui flows to Cook's Straits, and is navigated by the natives nearly from its source to its embouchure. Nor will the lake-storms, so much feared, and with reason, by the native in his light canoe, be any great hindrance to the more powerful and better-prepared boat of the European. Nothing can be expected in the way of agricultural settlements in this district, as it teems with boiling springs, and their concomitants, basaltic rocks and scoræ. The lake itself is about thirty-six miles long, by five-and-twenty broad, and forms the centre of the volcanic region, where, even now, volcanic action is going on, and which in days past had its principal point of activity in the crater of Tongariroo, the base of which is twelve miles from the shore of the lake. Without enumerating or attempting to describe all the warm ponds and springs of this remarkable region, we may extract the following striking description from Dr. Dieffenbach's work:—

"The most interesting hot-springs and fumeroles are in the delta which the Waikato has formed in entering the lake on its left shore, and on the sides of the hills which bound the delta to the south-west. The scenery on the western

shore of the lake is magnificent, vigorous trees overhanging the black nachitic or basaltic escarpments of the shore. Here and there are native houses and cleared places on the precipitous hills. Where this shore joins the delta of the Waikato, there is a narrow belt of flat land, on which stands the village of Te-rapa. Behind it the hills rise to about a hundred feet above the lake. In ascending, the ground is found to be of a high temperature; the surface is often bare, or is scantily covered with mosses and lichens; it is formed of a red or white clay, of a soft and alkaline nature, which the natives use instead of soap, and sometimes eat. Gaseous effluvia seem to have converted the rock of the hill, which is basalt, and sometimes amygdaloid, into this clay. When we approach the top of this amphitheatre of hills, the scene which presents itself is very striking. Vapours issue from hundreds of crevices, and in most of these places there are shallow springs, the bottom of which is a soft mud, into which a stick can be easily driven ten feet. The temperature of the water is from 200° to 212° Fahrenheit. In some springs it has an argillaceous, in others a sulphurous, taste. A subterranean noise is continually heard, resembling the working of a steam-engine, or the blast of an iron-foundry. By placing some fern over a crevice, and their food (potatoes, kumeras, or pork) upon it, the natives have a ready and convenient oven."—Pp. 339, 340.

Strange, indeed, are Nature's works in this warm-water region. Sometimes on the very edge of the lake are warm ponds of a tepid heat, natural warm baths, and used as such by the natives; in another place a hot spring is side-by-side with a very strong cold saline one; here a hot—boiling-hot—pond of water discharges itself into a cold river, whilst in other places the lake itself steams from the heat of the waters discharged into it. The ground all round sounds hollow and treacherous to the footstep. Sometimes the hot stream is quiet, in other places the clear transparent water is all ebullition, throwing itself up to the height of five or six feet from its bubbling bed, at intervals of but a few seconds. The whole area seems a thin warm crust, over caverns of boiling water, little more than a foot in thickness, with a hard thin white surface, then friable earth, to which succeeds earth impregnated with sulphate of iron or sulphur, and chalcedony, sometimes formed, sometimes in the process of formation. Below this crust is the hot black mud already mentioned, and "it often happens," says Dr. Dieffenbach, "that this crust breaks in, and dreadful scaldings frequently occur. Near one of the springs, beautiful saucer-shaped aggregations of silex shoot up, not unlike fungi on a moist surface."

The learned doctor was unfortunate in arriving at Tongariroo, when the great chief of the neighbourhood, previous to his departure on some expedition, had tabooed the mountain, and thus rendered it unapproachable by any human foot. The unauthorised ascent of a traveller of the name of Bedwill, whose account the doctor inserts in his book, was the cause of the taboo on the back-bone of the Tapuna, or great ancestor, as the natives designate this, their holy mountain. Tongariroo, though apparently the centre of the volcanic action of the island, has done little more, for as long as the native traditions extend, than cast up a few thin showers of ashes, and pour forth a warm stream of commingled mud and water from the bottom of its ashy crater; little snow is found on the mountain-peak, due, perhaps,

to the heat of the latent volcano, if the last traveller who ascended the "holy backbone" was not deceived in the height of the snow-covered mountains that surround Tongariroo. Here, too, in all probability, is the central cause of the slight earthquakes that are felt as far as Port Nicholson towards the south, and the valley of the Thames to the north-west; and even at Cloudy Bay, in the middle island. The old mythological traditions seem to point to this fact. The myth of the quarrel between Tongariroo and his two wives, now the mountains of Paihanga and Hauhungatahi, once placed by his side, but now removed far from their mountain lord, as well as the story of the former union of Mount Egmont and the Holy Mountain, may, with good reason, be considered as pointing to some great convulsion of nature, in which a great mountain-ridge, from Cape Egmont to Tongariroo, was rent asunder, and portions of it, perhaps, engulfed, as the traditional fate of the native village on the site of the Maupere Lake. The bed of the deep and rapid Waikato, with its cliffs of pumice-stone, is another evidence of the violent action due at some early period to the volcanoes of this district.

Passing by Doctor Dieffenbach's interesting description of the continuous collection of boiling pools and smoking fissures, as well on the plain as on the swell of the base of Maunga-Tauhara, to the banks of the Waikato, let us give, with some abridgment, his account of the boiling lake and cascade of Rotu-Mahana, at which the Doctor's party, after losing their way, at last arrived, under the guidance of two natives, whom they fell in with, near a travelling potatoe-ground, as they are called, some little distance from the banks of the Waikato.

"On the first of June we passed a hill at a short distance to the northward of our route. It was of considerable elevation, and had its original composition almost entirely converted into red and white clay by the hot gases which issued from its whole surface. Towards evening we reached the hills which surround on all sides the Rotu-Mahana, or warm lake. When we arrived on the crest of these hills, the view which opened was one of the grandest I had ever beheld. Let the reader imagine a lake of a deep blue colour, surrounded by verdant hills; in the lake several islets, some showing the bare rock, others covered with shrubs, while on all of them steam issued from a hundred openings between the green foliage, without impairing its freshness: on the opposite side a flight of broad steps of the colour of white marble, with a rosy tint, and a cascade of boiling water falling over them into the lake. A part of the lake was separated from the rest by a ledge of rocks, forming a lagoon in a state of ebullition, which discharged its waters into the Rotu-Mahana. We descended to the lake, but a heavy rain came on, and night surprised us. Next morning some natives came in a canoe to fetch us over to their settlement. We were first conveyed to the cascade which we had seen the evening before, and which is called Wakatara; the steps proved to be the silicious deposits of the waters of the hot pond above them. We ascended the steps, which are about fifty in number, from one to two feet broad; many of them, however, being subdivisions resulting from the gradual deposition of the silex. The water which falls over them was moderately tepid. The steps are firm, like porcelain, and have a tinge of carmine. The concretions assume interesting forms of mammillary stalagmites of the colour of milk-white chalcedony; and, here and there, where the rounded steps overhung the former deposits, stalactites of various

sizes were depending. The boiling pond on the top, which was clear and blue, could not be approached, as the concretions at its margin were very thin and fragile. The pond was about ten yards round, and perhaps one hundred feet above the level of the Rotu-Mahana. The water which is discharged into the lake from this pond, and from other places, warms its waters to 55° Fahrenheit above the temperature of the air; that is to say, to 95°. There are also springs in the lake itself, as in many places bubbles are seen rising up. On the banks of the lake itself are a great many openings from which steam rises. We afterwards landed on a small rock in the lake, composed of a felspathic lava; the natives had some houses on it, and cooked our food over a steaming crevice, while I bathed in the warm lake. The Rotu-Mahana is not more than a mile in circumference."—Vol. i. pp. 381—383.

Having thus passed from the settlements on the east and west coasts of the northern end of the northern island, through the centre of the country to the volcanic region, we will descend the south-western side of Tongariroo, and gradually escaping from the brown-looking vegetation of this region, at last approach, from the land-side, the latest of the settlements of the New Zealand Company, which they have established on the west coast, at the bottom of a small bay formed by the promontory of Cape Egmont. The settlement still bears, among many persons, the Indian name of Taranaki, and musters already nearly a thousand emigrants; it is at present the most northern of the Company's settlements.

The settlement of Taranaki may be said to comprehend the shore-country from Cape Egmont; the land is elevated, consisting mostly of marl, and a stiff blue clay, or a yellow sandstone, covered with a thick layer of loam. Above these cliffs the country is undulating, and overgrown with ferns, interspersed with considerable groves of trees. The soil seems abundantly fertile, and the vegetation extends to the sea-shore. Further inland low hills begin to rise, with gentle declivities and rounded summits, in many parts, to all appearance, overgrown with trees. The fertility and suitableness of this settlement for agricultural operations, seem to be admitted on all hands; and though harbour there is none for vessels of any great burden, yet the heavy moorings laid down by the Company have rendered the roadstead of Taranaki safe in all weathers, and relieved the settler from the fear of not being able to export the surplus production he has every reason to expect in this settlement. The following is the account of the settlement by a labouring emigrant but a very short time after its foundation; there is an honest originality about the letter:—

"To MR. SAMUEL CROCKER, *Revelstoke, from his Daughter-in-law.*

"New Plymouth, Feb. 10th, 1842.

"DEAR FATHER,—We have sent these letters home by Captain Liardet, the Governor of New Plymouth. Captain Liardet and mate, and one of the Caw-sand men, were clearing out one of the great guns, and the gun went off, and the sand and powder flew up in their faces and eyes. Captain Liardet has lost one eye, and is very likely to lose the other; he is going home to England; every one is sorry for him, he is such a good man. I should be very glad to hear that Captain Kingcombe had taken his place to come here to New

Zealand. The governor will give you the true account of the place. As to saying that there is no harbour here for ships to lie in a storm, they can make a very fine harbour, but they must send home to England first about it. There is a fine harbour down to the Waitera, fourteen miles from here. They have grown fine wheat and barley here; the finest that you ever saw, very fine; and new potatoes and turnips on Christmas-day for dinner. Dear father, when we get together Jane is sure to say, "now John, if poor father was but here, and Samuel, how happy we should be;" and John's answer is, "I wish he was, my dear, he would be quite happy here, to see our gardens and land, and to walk over them." Henry and Charles go to school. Henry is just learning to write; the schoolmaster is just newly set up; it is sixpence a week for Charles, and ninepence a week for Henry; he has been at writing some weeks. Dear father, please to bring me and Jane out a barrel of pilchards each; please to buy a gardening hook too. There are plenty of mackerel here, but no nets to catch them, and there are pilchards; please to bring one good pilchard net. I must beg of you once more to bring dear Samuel with you. I have sent him a letter; when I wrote yours I did not think I should have time to write him one, as there was a ship in sight, but it was not coming here. It is a great thoroughfare here for ships, they are often in sight. Dear father, on Christmas-day six of us went up to the Moturoa Chapel, to hear Mr. Creed, and the chapel was quite full of poor missionaries. When we came home we had cold fig pudding, and cold leg of pork, dressed the day before; ten of us sat down to dinner. In the afternoon we went to see the land, and in the evening we went to chapel. The sand has been tried, and it is more than half iron; and in the interior, about a mile from ours, there is stone with lead in it all over the place. I wish it had been in ours to have had a mine. It is a valuable country."

From the letter of Mr. Carrington to his brother, Major Carrington, we learn that coal has been found on the banks of the Mokau, and limestone and coal in abundance about five-and-twenty miles off, on the north-east coast. Iron ore has been picked up on the beach, and veins of it found in the vicinity of the town; add to this a bank of whiting, and three seams of coal, within five miles of the settlement, discovered by Mr. Perry, the Company's surveyor.* A Devonshire yeoman of the name of Bayly, a true specimen of the class especially suited for New Zealand colonization, gives the most useful description of the settlement we have met with; with a little money, much industry, and a competent share of knowledge, he shows what the advantages of the colony are to men of his class. He clearly sees who those are that grumble—the land speculators and the idlers—whilst all the real working-land purchasers are content. Whilst at Port Nicholson, on the way to his new home, this emigrant fell in with a Wesleyan missionary, who told him that the district of Taranaki was the garden of New Zealand. The missionary knew it from mere inspection; six months' experience quite bore out his eulogistic account.

"And now I have seen it, and upwards of six months' experience, and found it, by the mouth of another Wesleyan missionary—his name is Creed—all to be true. *Here are thousands and tens of thousands of acres as level as can be found in England; I would say, when the land is cleared, all that I have seen, that the plough shall go over nineteen acres out of twenty. The soil is very deep*

* Letter of John Perry, Esq. pp. 139, 140.—Letters from Emigrants.

in high land as well as low. I believe for climate and soil not better to be found in the known world. I know a man that has tilled the third crop of potatoes in the same piece of ground, and I am expecting a crop within twelve months. In front of my house there are many acres of potatoes, Indian corn, pumpkins, melons, cucumbers, peas, beans, cabbages, greens, turnips, radishes, and many things else; and you may till this in five hundred acres together, as well as here, and answer well. There is fern, bush, and timber land to clear; fern and bush extend about two miles back from the sea shore; then the timber. This fern and bush, supposed anciently to be timber-land, destroyed by the natives and tilled. This fern and bush-land, first you must cut it all down and dry it well, then set fire to it, and it will burn the very surface of the earth; you may pull up a great part of the moats with a trifle of mattock labour. Bush and fern land will pay the first crop for clearing, and a good crop will pay double; for the first crop must be potatoes; for many years past they averaged in Sydney 6*l.* a ton, and they are eight or ten this present, and have been more. Tons have been brought by vessels and sold at 1½*d.* per lb. in this place. Natives have plenty, and they know how to sell as well as we know how to buy. I have now in the ear, in my house, wheat, barley, and oats, as fine a sample as ever I wish to see, grown in this place; but the second crop is much finer than the first; and our Rev. Mr. Creed says, since his experience, the more tilled the better the crop.

"Thomas and I have cleared one town section each, and tilled to many sorts; beans, peas, cabbage, greens, pumpkins, melons, radishes, turnips, do well; French beans and carrots do not answer.

"I have built two houses with wood on my town section, sixteen feet by sixteen and a half, with a wood floor under, and a sley on the back, seven feet by sixteen and a half, with a cob chimney; the wood is of one tree, it is of red pine."*

According to another emigrant,† the town of New Plymouth (we wish they had retained the old name of Taranaki) is situated between two small rivers, which he compares with two that flowed near his native place of Shaftesbury, abounding with trout and eels, "with water as good as ever tasted;" whilst another pair of emigrants laud the luxuriance of the crops, and the abundance of fish and pigeons in the vicinity of the settlement.‡ "No tract of land," writes a third emigrant, of a higher class, "has yet been discovered equal to it. Streams innumerable intersect it in every direction, which renders it admirably calculated for the labours of the agriculturist. The soil on the coast is light, and in many parts sandy, with an orange marl subsoil. Inland, a couple of miles or so, the soil becomes heavier, a mixture of loam and clay, better suited for wheat than the other. The former grows fine potatoes, cabbages, enormous carrots, turnips, and other vegetables."§

Much has been said of the badness of the roadstead at Taranaki, and, in consequence of the loss of the *Regina*, soon after the opening of the settlement, and the accident to another vessel, the *Oriental*, the port of New Plymouth has been widely condemned. In the worst of winds, according to Captain Liardet of the navy, the road-

* Letters from Emigrants, pp. 145, 146.

† Stephen Gillingham to his Father, p. 153.

‡ Simon and Jane Andrews, laboucing emigrants, to their parents, p. 153.

§ Letter from H. R. A——, Esq., to Mr. T. C——, in Cornwall, p. 157.

stead is now perfectly safe, from the heavy moorings laid down by the Company; and if the weather-table, given by the Brothers Halse, from the middle of February, 1842, to the tenth of May, be a sure guide, little need be feared as to dangerous gales. In three autumnal months, about fifty days are registered as calm, about half-a-dozen have the word "breeze" written opposite, and about as many are "showery;" the remainder of the days being fairly divided between strong north and south-westerly winds.* Roads are being provided, both south-eastwards to Port Nicholson, and northwards to the rich agricultural district of the Waitera river. One thing seems much required—Emigrants—not a few and far between, but a steady and continuous supply; some ready to expend a little capital in bringing to the surface the metallic treasures of the district; some prepared to earn good wages, though not the wages at present given, in consequence of the great scarcity of labour; but far more those who will purchase a small sub-urban or rural property, and with their own hands, and the aid of their own families or imported labourers, farm their own section, and become the producers of the settlement. *Working farmers, with a few hundreds, are the emigrants for New Plymouth.* The visit of the Bishop to this young settlement seems to have been most timely and beneficial. Previous to his coming, the Wesleyans were the sole religious teachers of the people, and many a member of the Church had already aided them in building their chapel, and attended their worship, in default of that which the Church did not afford him in his new home. "The recent visit of the Bishop," says Mr. Wicksteed,† "has put Churchmen on the alert. In a few months, they subscribed 80*l.* a-year for the support of a clergyman, and no doubt the sum will be raised to a 100*l.* The Bishop, out of the fund at his disposal, adds 150*l.*, besides 100*l.* as a sort of outfit for the first year, so that a decent provision is made for a clergyman, expected to arrive in the course of two or three months." It was October when Bp. Selwyn left Wellington to walk across to this young settlement, accompanied by some native carriers. A slight accident detained him on the road, but at last he reached Taranaki, where he would have stayed some time, had not the Chief-Justice arrived in the Government brig, with whom he proceeded for the Straits. Short as was his stay, many of the settlers' letters prove how beneficial it was; and no few of the thousand settlers at Taranaki look forward to the coming of the promised clergyman and the rapid rising of a church in the new colony.‡

The following description of the scenery and situation of the New Plymouth district will form a good conclusion to our attempted account of the settlement:—

* Letter from William and Henry Halse to their father, J. Halse, Esq. Letters from Emigrants, pp. 170—172.

† Letter from T. T. Wicksteed, Esq. to the Editor of the Colonial Gazette. Letters from Emigrants, pp. 198.

‡ Bishop's Letters, pp. 11, 12. Letters from Emigrants, p. 208.

From the Note-book of a Tourist.—"For the first time in New Zealand we could see from our deck a wide green plain, edged by a line of glistening surf, and towered over, not by many ranges of mountains, but by one solitary mass, standing clear and alone—Mount Egmont. By-and-bye, the huge bare Sugar-loaves stood clearly out, patches of green, scattered houses, and then the town or village of Taranaki. The township lies very prettily, being gathered into three small groups, villages, or, if you please, village-lets, each upon its stream. The streams are all beautiful brooks, galloping or gliding over stony beds to the sea. The whole of the scattered population is estimated at 900. Mount Egmont was cloudless for the first time for many days, and glorious beyond all conceptions of mine. I had never fully realised the majesty of one kingly, unapproachable giant peak, lifting itself alone toward heaven. The land (town, sub-urban, rural,) extends, with scarcely broken continuity, over a slightly undulating surface, extending twelve miles or more to the northward, and from four to five miles broad. It is, indeed, a land worthy of all we have heard of New Zealand; a land of deep rich mould—of luxuriant wood—of full streams, the sight of which gladdens you, as you see them leaping on from the great mountain to the sea. And then there are cottages after cottages, with tasty gardens (the native trees and tree-ferns left here and there to throw their shadows across the thatch), and neat gates and compact fences; and you meet with all the little civilities and kindly greetings of the west-country peasantry. There was one spot I could scarcely leave, commanding a view which I never expect to see equalled. We looked from a cliff over a huge hollow, filled with the richest wood of every shade of colour—a blue stream rushing and winding through the midst, and beyond, the clear dazzling cone whence it was flowing. Then came up, ever and anon, the piping, gushing, and trilling of birds, just as we heard them in the woods near the Porirua road. * * * *"—*Auckland Chronicle*.

Dr. Dieffenbach accompanied the agent of the New Zealand company when he sailed to Cook's Straits, and effected the purchase of the country where the towns of Wellington and Port Nicholson are situated. "Nearly three years," says the Doctor, "have passed since our first visit; and a spot scarcely known before that time, and rarely, if ever, visited by Europeans, has become the seat of a large settlement, with nearly 5000 inhabitants. Where a few hundred natives then lived in rude villages, fearful of their neighbours, but desirous of intercourse with Europeans, and just beginning to be initiated into the forms of Christian worship by a native missionary, there is now a town, with warehouses, wharfs, club-houses, horticultural and scientific societies, race-courses—in short, *all* the mechanism of a civilized and commercial community." "*Where*," says the Bishop, "*everything will have to be done. There appears to be neither school nor chapel connected with the Church, nor provision for either.*" That the New Zealand Company have made a mistake in placing their chief settlement in this spot, will hardly be doubted when the position of the port is considered. Take the description by their own surveyor, Dr. Dieffenbach.

"Port Nicholson is situated in a foreland, which, in its longest extent, has a north-east to a south-west direction, and which is formed to the south-east by the deep inundation of Wairarapa or Palliser Bay, and to the north-west by the height of the coast in which Mana, or Table Island, is situated. This is the narrowest point of Cook's Straits; the distance to the nearest land in the middle island being only thirty miles. The winds prevailing on this part of

Cook's Straits the greater part of the year, are from the south and south-east, and often increase to heavy gales, augmenting the rush of water through the Straits, and making considerable inroads on the coast. Port Nicholson was doubtless thus formed, and the general aspect of the foreland in which the harbour is situated bears decided proof of the wear and tear of the coasts. The best harbour for ships is opposite the embouchure of the river Hutt, and is formed by the curved peninsula of the western headland. Here they obtain good holding ground, with great facility for discharging their cargoes, and are protected from the prevailing winds, which are north-west for two hundred days in the year, and south and south-east during the remainder. That the harbour is good and convenient, is proved by the fact, that more than two hundred vessels have entered and cleared it in safety, although the entrance, without the assistance of charts, is somewhat difficult, and no care has been taken to erect a light-house. The boundary hills, both to the east and west of Port Nicholson, rise abruptly from the water's edge: but in that peninsular part where the town of Wellington has been founded, there is a strip of flat land at their base, about one third of a mile broad, consisting of a soil composed of sand, shells, shingle, and vegetable earth, and extending to the western headland of the harbour, where the hills are low and undulating. At the town of Wellington there is consequently a long line of water frontage, with deep water at a few yards from the shore. The neck of land between the island of Mana and Port Nicholson consists of hills, with deep ravines, intersected by water-courses, where the natives have some plantations. Of similar configuration is the neck of land separating the Port from Palliser Bay. At high water the passage from Wellington to the head of the Bay was impassable; but since I left Port Nicholson a road has been made, connecting the valley of the Hutt immediately with the town."—Vol. i. pp. 70—72.

Now it is very evident, from this account, that Wellington has been placed on a narrow spot of flat land, far from extensive enough to accommodate the buildings requisite for a large town. A location one-third of a mile broad and two miles long will hardly contain a great mercantile town; and when the absence of flat land compels the inhabitants to resort to the hills that rise so abruptly on all sides, and are so steep that only spots here and there can be selected for building on, it exposes them to all the inconvenience of placing different parts of the town as much as four miles apart from one another. The harbour is safe, very safe, when you get into it, which, considering the heavy gales so prevalent in Cook's Straits, is a matter of congratulation to many a ship-master. But must you not have something more than deep water, good holding-ground, and hardly enough land whereon to erect habitations, to constitute even a purely commercial city? Are you to be dependent on importation for your supplies, or forced to draw them from districts far removed and separated from the town by the abruptly-rising mountains that close in the settlement on every side? Doubtless there is land, much and good, in the valley of the Hutt or Eritonga, or in that of the Manawatu—land that will amply repay the farmer his outlay of money and labour, if he can but afford to expend them. This is very well for persons of fair capital, but it is very disheartening, not to say ruinous, to the small farmer who has land allotted to him in the valleys of Eritonga, Manawatu, Waunganui, or Wypas, to find that he must be at no slight expense in transporting himself

and his luggage to his own land; and that if he requires labourers, he must bribe them to undertake the journey into the bush. The consequence of this is, men totally unsuited to the occupation are driven by the fear of expense into trade, the real merchants are injured, and the rise of the colony is hindered. In time, all this will right itself; but it will be only by time, and by an outlay of great extent in opening up communications with the valleys in the interior, that the town of Wellington will be really prosperous. Till then, the colony will not support itself; and though the whaling-trade of the Straits will keep up a certain demand and supply, it is useless to deny, that to that alone the town can trust; and other trade it will not have to any extent so long as it is shut out from the interior. Every new road into the bush will add ten producing working farmers to the colony, and every increase of produce will create that trade on which, more than any other settlement in the island, Wellington must, in the main, depend. At present, this is not the settlement for the yeoman-farmer. The presence of a good harbour here will be as prejudicial, by creating a temporary trade, to the inward progress of the colony, as the absence of it at Taranaki will force the settlers there to trust to the riches of their country, and turn to profit the treasures the land there affords to the labour of man.

The lands in the various valleys near Wellington are subject to floods of considerable violence and extent from the rivers that run through them, and yet the grain crops seem rather to be benefited than injured by the waters. In the valley of the Hutt, Mr. Molesworth raised, on land flooded four several times, crops of grain of ninety bushels to the acre, and eighteen tons of potatoes from the same amount and quality of land. If we may judge from but a few examples, a flood in New Zealand seems to produce the same effects as a frost in our climate in the destruction of the grub, whilst, at the same time, it fertilizes the fields, and is not followed by the destructive frosts which usually succeed such visitations in England. The following is an emigrant's account of the valley of the Wanganui, about one hundred miles from Wellington, a valley better suited to the small farmer, as presenting a ready water-communication with Port Nicholson and New Plymouth; midway between which places it is situated. The letter, also, shows the disadvantages of Port Nicholson in an incidental, but remarkable, manner.

"The river itself constitutes part of the great highway between Port Nicholson, the seat of government, and the Bay of Islands, in the north. It is also opposite the Nelson settlement in Blind Bay, at about thirty miles distance, and from its position relatively to India, Sydney, and the Australian colonies, the passage through Cook's Straits is avoided in voyaging between it and those places. Within fifty miles of the entrance of the river, are the Islands of Kapiti and Mana, and it is the centre of the most prolific whaling-grounds.

"The Wanganui is a bar river, and in Wylde's Map, twelve feet at high water is erroneously marked on the bar, whereas, from actual sounding, I find that *there is sixteen feet*. When the *Clydeside* went in she drew ten feet; it

was then rather more than half tide, and twelve feet was sounded in the channel. From the size of the river, it is visited by foreign vessels, and is thus enabled to carry on an independent trade; whilst its facilities for the business of a ship-wright are so great, that it has already become celebrated as the place of building most of the vessels used in the coasting-trade of New Zealand. To give you some idea of the capabilities of this splendid river harbour, I may mention, that off my township of Knowsley, which is situate about seven miles from the mouth of the river, on its north bank, I have capital anchorage in five fathom water; indeed the Hutt, compared to it, is as a puddle to a mill-stream.

"We are not here subject to the tremendous gales, which I mentioned to you in my former letters as being particularly disadvantageous to Port Nicholson, as well from their violence as their duration (lasting two or three days), and rendering the cultivation of fruits, &c., precarious, except in its *well-sheltered valleys*; and having a comparatively level track of land, our communication with the adjoining country is perfectly easy, which is not the case at Wellington, owing to the height of the hills, which separate the beach from the bush. We have already become the principal, as we are the *nearest*, district, for the supply of fruits, corn, and general produce, to Port Nicholson. *The farms here rival those of the best cultivated soils of England: and such is the propitious nature of both soil and climate, that sheep and cattle fatten by grazing on the wild pasturage, as well as those fed by the hand of man at home.* Although New Zealand, generally, is a remarkably healthy climate, yet Wanganui and Taranaki are decidedly superior to the other settlements in healthfulness; and if invalids ever come to New Zealand from India, they must and will locate themselves in one or other of these two. The summer is very hot, but not as in England—sultry, there being a constant cool air floating about you everywhere; whilst that period which we call our winter is *with us* totally devoid (as I have before written) of violent gales of wind.

"Wanganui has got into notice in New Zealand, merely by the force of its natural capabilities; and, now that people are looking out for themselves, we have scarcely a week pass without adding to the list of our inhabitants, the more particularly since the *Clydeside* brought so many of that useful class of settlers, who combine the possession of some capital with much energy, and, amongst the rest, several Scotch agricultural families, who, together with the others in that ship, had been living some time in Port Nicholson, and having explored Wanganui and other places, gave the preference to this.

"The expense of living is here, indeed, almost too insignificant to mention. We get plenty, not only of the necessaries, but many of what are esteemed in England, the luxuries of life. A cow, with a calf by her side, we get for 10*l.*; a good useful horse for 35*l.* (this price is coming down). We have an abundance of pigs, and our river abounds with white-bait, eels, baracouta, karwi, plaice, soles, oysters, &c. &c., and though last, not least, the harbouka, the finest fish ever tasted. At the heads of our river you can see fish, weighing one cwt. each, in such quantities, that it is impossible to count them. We have hanging in our smoking-room hams, German sausages, bacon, saveloys, fish, &c. In our salting-tubs pork, &c.; and we get pigeons, ducks, snipes, &c. &c. for the shooting; to these we add, from our own stock, poultry and eggs. I think you will not find fault with our "*carte*" of vegetables and fruits, when I tell you that in my own garden, I have growing, amongst other things, peaches, apricots, plums, melons, strawberries, *west ham*, cabbage, peas, beans, brocoli, carrots, cauliflowers, turnips, sweet herbs, &c. &c.; in short, I can truly say, '*Here one can live in ease, without care or trouble, in one of the most genial and healthy climates in the world, and where it only requires the hand of man to make a Paradise.*'"

The demand for labour in Wellington is at present considerable; but, being chiefly on public works, and not in agricultural operations,

there is less probability of the demand continuing than in such places as Auckland, New Plymouth, or Nelson, where commerce can not only be combined with, but effectually supported and protected by agricultural operations, almost within sight of the place of consumption and exportation. But let us now pass on to the third settlement of the New Zealand Company—the town and port of Nelson, the scene of the late unfortunate *rencontre*.

The settlement of Nelson is at present the only European colony on the great middle island, situated at the bottom of a deep gulph on the south shore, and within a few miles of the south-western headland of Cook's Straits, to which Cook gave the name of Blind Bay, when he endeavoured to find a passage through it to the other coast. In this settlement the Company seems to have sacrificed the position of the town to the position of the harbour: the temptation of a harbour, large, safe, and with a good depth of water, has led them to locate the town of Nelson at some distance from its rural lands. Sandspit makes a natural breakwater, and the formidable Arrow rock guards the entrance of the harbour. The town of Nelson lies in a flat plain, about a mile from the port, and connected with it, by a fair road over a high hill, and another by the beach; for here the rise of the hills is abrupt from the shore, though the town has plenty of room for growing, by being located at a distance from its harbour. "There is some very good land here," says Mr. Cullen,* "but it is very hilly, and the hills are so steep, that a person standing on the side of them would be afraid to look to the top, lest he should break his neck at the bottom. For our marsh land we must go a long way from Nelson." The valley of the Waimea is the chief agricultural district of this settlement, and, even allowing a fair discount on the following description, seems to promise well; one thing alone is not mentioned—it is easy of approach from Nelson and the harbour.†

"The whole valley of the Waimea may be equally valuable and interesting; but as my acquaintance with it is but limited, I must confine my description to that portion lying between the bottom of Blind Bay and a river which runs into the Waimea, about six miles south. The range of hills on the east, and the Waimea on the west, form the other boundaries of the district. The whole of this extent is level, unless a series of low hills which jut out from the foot of the grand range about a mile or two into the plain be included within it. The part next the sea is chiefly occupied by an immense bed of flax, which runs about a mile and a half in the direction of the length of the valley. The grass is very fine, and, together with sow-thistle which springs up amongst it, forms quite a thick carpet. Here is probably abundant pasturage for cattle. Next commences a thick bush, which extends to the river both on the south and west. The bush is accompanied by flax, fern, &c.; and the whole may readily be cleared off by fire. A large space, especially adjoining the hills, is covered with fern, some of which is of enormous growth.

"The soil, judging from the general abundance and freshness of vegetation, is very good. Its depth (from three or four trials) may be stated at about one

* Letter of Mr. W. O. Cullen to Mr. Turner.—Letters from Emigrants, p. 76.

† M. Barnicoat to Editor of Nelson Examiner.—Letters from Emigrants, p. 69.

foot on the hills, and in the plain itself about two. One or more of the different varieties of grass is almost everywhere to be met with. Sow-thistle is extremely abundant; the greater part of the plain is free from marsh, and bears no marks of being ever flooded. The large flax bed mentioned above is marshy: the rest is generally dry.

"The district is well watered. Besides the large rivers, which form two of its boundaries, several small streamlets issue from the lofty range of hills on the eastern side, and intersect the plain. Water may also, probably, be anywhere found, with but little trouble, by sinking a well, the digging of which occupied one man about two hours, and which has for three weeks past afforded a plentiful supply.

"This fertile plain presents no obstructions to being brought into immediate cultivation, with the exception of the marsh, which would require previous draining; unless, indeed, its natural produce (flax) should prove valuable. This marsh, which is only partially wet at present, adjoins the sea—is in one compact mass, and otherwise presents facilities for being drained. It might in a great measure be freed from water, by merely affording channels to one or two small streamlets, which, having no present outlet, expand themselves into the marsh in question. But the wet ground is very inconsiderable in extent, compared to the more available ground producing fern and grass. The former is at present apparently ready for the plough, particularly where it has been burnt; and the latter, even if left unimproved, must be valuable for pasturage.

"The scarcity of timber may be considered one of the drawbacks to the value of this district. Little or none of any size grows within its limits. However, an inexhaustible supply may be obtained on the other side of the Waimea. The small valleys, also, on the eastern side, are wooded, and fine timber may be procured from them.

"Its facilities for communication are remarkable. The sea skirts its northern end. The river Waimea is navigable at least along a considerable portion of its western side; and the river at the south end, where I have seen it, is sufficiently wide and deep; but I cannot say how far it may be available for purposes of transport. Besides these means of water-communication, a good road may be obtained by following up to its head the principal valley in which Nelson is situated. *A moderate slope separates this from another valley, which opens into a plain adjoining that of the Waimea.* When once on the plain itself, the formation of roads is comparatively easy, and good materials are almost everywhere at hand.

"The little branch valleys abound with pigeons, parrots, pheasants, and many other birds. The rivers are frequented in great numbers by ducks and other water-fowl."

Considering how lately the settlement has been founded, it is not to be wondered that the wages in this "great pic-nic party," as a settler not unaptly describes it, should be ruinously high, and that labourers are idle and dissolute. Such must always be the fate of every new settlement, for a time. But it is an evil that every fresh arrival tends to abate, and every new emigrant helps to lessen. The prospect of immense remuneration for little work has this bad effect on a new colony; it brings to it a class of persons who are far better away, and lays the foundation of a restless, and discontented population. It cannot be too often repeated, that such emigrants as are generally produced by such a demand as this will be the ruin of New Zealand. For a time they will work little and make much, but this cannot last long. They look forward to a rising commerce. They must remember they have yet to raise the productions on

which to exist, and that some time and much hard labour must precede the exportation of surplus production. There is hardly any view more mistaken than that of sacrificing an agricultural to a commercial situation. To found a new settlement as a commercial one, is putting the cart before the horse, and beginning at the wrong end. This mistake has been fallen into to some extent by the New Zealand Company; good harbours have been sore temptations to them, and have led them to places where, doubtless, eventually commerce will rise, but not until, by a very great outlay, an easy communication is opened between the towns and their agricultural districts. Such emigrants as look to handicrafts, such as are in request in towns, will find a demand for their labour at Ports Nicholson and Nelson, and Auckland. Those who would work the ground to their own support, and with the hope of supplying their town consumers, or even exporting, will naturally seek such districts as those at Auckland, lying immediately round and close to the town and port, or the fruitful valley of the Wanganui and its navigable river, and the rich flats of Taranaki and its improved and improvable roadstead. The progress of all the settlements in New Zealand, and especially of those which look to a distant rural district for their support, will be slow; nor is this to be regretted, so far as it will affect the native population. A sudden incursion of many thousands of Europeans would have either driven back the native, as in America and Australia, or reduced him once more to his former barbarism. A slow, but gradual, influx of colonists will neither excite his fears, nor deprive him of his paternal fields, and both he and the colonists will more speedily recognise the advantage to both of mingling together and endeavouring to lay the foundation of a mixed population.

The native of New Zealand is a far more interesting character than his Australian brother, and far more adapted to civilization, and inclined to render himself useful. He is both ready to learn and by no means deficient in the powers of emulation and acquisition of knowledge, and, long before the white man came, had no contemptible knowledge, after his own fashion. Few races have stopped at such a low point in their own civilization who have evinced so ardent a desire to learn the white man's ways. The foundation of new colonies seems to stimulate their industry; and directly a settlement is formed, the natives in the vicinity increase their maize and potatoe-grounds, and eagerly profit by the new market. Two races, or, at least, castes of natives, are found on the island; one having a light, clear, brown complexion, the other much darker. In the former race the men are of good form and stature, straight features, and long black hair, generally lank or at the most slightly curled; the eyes dark, the teeth white, the limbs well proportioned. In the other race the head appears compressed, the figure short and ill proportioned, the hair woolly, the features full and large. The fact mentioned by Dieffenbach that he never yet found one of this latter race, though free, in any but a low grade among the tribes,

would almost warrant the theory of this being the aboriginal race, and assigning to the lighter race, with which they are now so closely intermingled, the character of an invading, conquering tribe.

"It is well known," says Dieffenbach, "that native girls before they are married can dispense their favours as they like—a permission which, as long as they lived in their primitive state, was, perhaps, not abused, as the *liaison* was binding, for the time being, even with Europeans. Afterwards girls became an article of trade with the chiefs in the shipping places, who regarded selling their women as the easiest method of getting commodities. But it must be admitted that parents, relations, and the females themselves are very anxious to unite in legal matrimonial ties with the whites, and that licentiousness is not an inherent part of their character. If these ties are in any way fixed, they are maintained on the part of the female with affection and faithfulness. Infanticide is there uncommon. I have known as many as six children of such mixed marriages; these results prove them one of the finest half-castes that exists, and, I would add, an improvement on the race, at least in its physical particulars, as far as can be judged from children. They retain, however, many of their mothers' peculiarities, especially in the colour and quality of their hair and eyes. They are generally attached to her race, and, of course, better acquainted with her language than with English."

From this mixed race, already numbering four hundred souls, we may look for considerable influence over both the native and the white races. Time and money cannot be better expended than in the education of these half-castes, as the connecting link between the native and the colonist, if not as the stock of a powerful race. The missionaries were unwise in viewing with contempt these marriages. They should rather have done their utmost to encourage them, and not have looked upon the natives as an inferior race of beings. The native chief to whose daughter an European is united, regards his son-in-law with the utmost respect, and permits him, or rather encourages him, to exercise a great influence over himself and his tribe. The ultimate blending of the races in New Zealand is to be looked forward to as one source of the strength and prosperity of the colony. When speaking of the domestic habits of the natives and of the able manner in which, without instruction, they can work from European drawings, proving no bad architects even of churches, Dr. Dieffenbach says:—

"The New Zealander has a fixed habitation, although he does not always reside in the same place. In his plantations, which are often at great distances from each other, or from the principal village, he possesses a house, which he inhabits when he goes there in the planting season. Part of his time he spends on visits to distant relations, or to European settlements on the coast, either for the purpose of trading or to see what the Pakea (stranger) is doing. I have scarcely ever been at a settlement where I did not meet visitors from distant parts of the country. These occasional visits are probably as useful to the natives, and tend as much to their real improvement, as a constant residence with white people would do. They have an insatiable curiosity to know and see everything that is going on, and an equal eagerness to communicate it to others. In this manner news and information of every description make their tour through the island, carried from tribe to tribe by oral communication. They are excellent observers; they soon discover the weak points of body or mind in others; and, although they regard us as vastly superior to themselves,

they soon become sensible to the evils our colonization carries with it. The points they find the most difficult in understanding are the different grades into which our society is divided, and the poverty and misery under which some of our classes labour, while others seem to lead a life of abundance and idleness."—Vol. ii. pp. 71, 72.

Twelve tribes, or great divisions of the natives, seem to include the little more than a hundred thousand savages still remaining in the New Zealand islands. The most powerful tribe, that of the Nga-te-kahuhunu, which inhabits the east coast and Hawriri, in Hawkes's Bay, contains in its eighteen subdivisions about five to six-and-thirty thousand persons. That of the Waikato, inhabiting the banks of that river, and the land from Manukao harbour to Makau, numbers twenty-four thousand. The next most numerous is the Nga-pui, of the Bay of Islands, the two divisions of the Nga-te-awa, on Cook's Straits and the east coast; and the Nga-te-wakana, of the interior of the northern island, each having some ten to thirteen thousand persons in their tribe. Three more tribes of the northern isle vary from three to five thousand, and two fall as low as six or eight hundred. On the middle isle only two tribes are enumerated, and stated to contain but twelve hundred persons between them both.

The earliest traditions of the New Zealanders attribute the creation of their present abode to the successful line-fishing of a demigod, called Mani-Mua, the eldest of a family of four brothers, whose names respectively mean that the eldest had pre-existence; the second, is within; the third, "who is without;" and the youngest, "that he came from heaven." Their parents are not known, nor is it known whither they came from, or on what they stood when the eldest, having baited his hook with the voluntarily-offered ear of his youngest brother, fished-up New Zealand from the depths of the sea. Mani and his brethren seem to have made no use of their new discovery, as tradition reports that, until the arrival of the present inhabitants in three canoes from the eastward, the islands were without people. The first of the canoes bore the ancestors of the three tribes that settled on the eastern coast of the islands, whilst in the two others were the founders of Waikato and Nga-te-awa tribes. They came from the eastward, from an island called the Hawaiki. The similarity between the native name of the Sandwich Islands and that of this fabled isle whence the canoes came, added to the great similarity of dialect between New Zealand and the Sandwich Islands, leads Dr. Dieffenbach, with some reason, to look to the latter group as, at the least, the latest source whence the present natives of New Zealand came: whilst old and vague traditions, and the presence in far distant islands of the same birds, utterly incapacitated from flying from one place to the other, seems to favour the by no means new theory of the great mass of the islands in those seas having once formed an extended continent, and been broken up into numberless islands by some great volcanic revolution. A certain

similarity of religious traditions, among which the origin of the islands by the fish-hook of the god is one, and also of domestic manners among the entire group of Polynesian Islands, seems to point to some far-off common origin to the inhabitants of these islands, whilst their traditions of long voyages, which they would now be unable to accomplish, or demi-gods, skilled in architecture, agriculture, and many an art now but partially known among them, seem to point to a higher state of civilization in the great parent nation from which they have all sprung, of which we see now only the remains. Like the traditional ancestors of the Mexican and his cognate tribes, they seem to have owned a purer worship than their descendants have retained, and to have attained to the dignity of demi-gods from the superiority of their civilization as compared to that of their present representatives.

No form of government can be more simple than that of a New Zealand tribe. Each tribe has its hereditary chief, the ariki; its freemen, rangatira; its tohunga, or priest; and its tanareka-reka, or slaves. The dignity of the ariki is hereditary, and may be held by a great warrior, a priest, or even a woman; if the representative of the chieftain's family, whether child or adult, he is equally revered by his people, and a sort of sacredness is attached to his person in war even by his enemies. The tribute and honours paid to him are voluntary, and his power is confined to the council, varying according to his abilities and reputation. The freemen rank from their power and prowess in war, and the actions and reputation of their ancestors. To each of them, equally with their ariki, the land of the tribe is meted out, and every rangatira has full powers over his own portion. The slaves are the result of successful war, the workers in the field, and the exclusive property of their master. The freemen live independently of each other; and each may assemble round him a tribe of his own, and build his own fortified village. The priest may come from the highest or lowest class; but the prayers, the witchcraft, and the dreams of an ariki are deemed more effective and true than those of a tohunga of inferior birth.

"There exists," says Dieffenbach, "a very distinct notion of the rights of landed property among the natives, and every inch of land in New Zealand has its proprietor. Sometimes land is given to a strange tribe, either as pay, or from other considerations; but the proprietor reserves certain rights, some of which are what we term manorial. It was formerly very common that the fat of the native rats killed on such lands should be given to the principal proprietor; and in many cases a title to land seems to have been derived from the fact of having killed rats on it. Thus a chief will often say, 'this or that piece of land is mine; I have killed rats upon it.' But generally the titles to land are derived from inheritance or conquest. The latter constitutes an acknowledged right; if, however, conquered land is again taken possession of by the original tribe, the right of the stronger prevails. In settling the complicated land question, as regards European buyers, many difficult cases of this kind will doubtless be brought forward, where the original tribe had returned, trusting for its security to the Europeans, and to the advance made in civilization, or to the weakened state of its enemies. The right certainly is on the side of the conqueror, although another tribe is in possession."—Vol. ii. pp. 114, 115.

We have been so long accustomed to read of the idolatry of the New Zealanders, and to see the pictures of the grotesque idols to whom we have believed that their worship was paid, that we can hardly credit the dicta of Dr. Dieffenbach on the religion of the natives. The idols, 'it seems, are the statues of their ancestors, or household ornaments and heir-looms they have derived from them. Definable system of religion they have not; and such mortals as Mani, the fisher, and E-pani, the introducer of the sweet potatoes, are regarded as the benefactors of their race; and having undergone some apotheosis, are endowed with supernatural powers. Their belief in spiritual agencies approaches nearest to religion. Atua and Wairua represent, the one the divinity under many forms, the other the spirits of the deceased, whom they regard as capable of assisting or injuring mortals. Many as are the forms which Atua can assume, in none of them is he worshipped, but every prayer is addressed to the spirit itself, unknown and unseen. Everything strange and new becomes an emanation of the divinity, and the compass and barometer are to them as much Atuas as the old recognised avatars of the cloud, the sun's ray, or the lizard. The Wairua can communicate with this world, but under no visible form; hardly, perhaps, that of the sun's ray or the passing shadow. In the low whistling of the wind, as it comes up from the ocean, or passes lightly over the tree tops, the tohunga hears the voice of the Wairua, to him speaking plain things, of which he is the interpreter to the people. Thus, with few ceremonies and no carefully-composed system of idolatry to contend with, the Christian missionaries found the natives ready listeners to the mysteries of the gospel. The priests had no great interest in resisting the teaching of the whites, and were far from intolerant of the new doctrine. The belief of the people was so vaguely monotheistic, and unsupported by the worship of visible representatives of the deity, that it presented few points of difficulty to the Christian teacher. Neither were the missionaries unaided by that innate curiosity that pervades the New Zealand character, that admiration for the white man's knowledge, that love of emulation of his actions, and that anxious desire to know and see what he is doing, though his motives may, to their limited capacities, be inscrutable. The tohungas rapidly gave up their own belief; and, being the depositories of the little learning of the nation, soon became the most powerful and energetic teachers of their brethren in the mysteries of the new faith.

So much space has already been devoted to our article, that we may not delay over the many interesting subjects commented upon by Dr. Dieffenbach, or draw further from his descriptions of the productions of the island and the life of its aboriginal inhabitants. Dieffenbach is one of the few travellers who does not indulge in the indiscriminate condemnation of savages, so common to missionaries and voyagers. His tone of mind, added to the intimate acquaintance he had with almost every tribe on the northern island,

and the care with which his opinion is evidently formed, after no hasty visit, renders his character of the natives doubly valuable. We can only regret that space forbids our extracting it at length.

"In their character the predominant feature is self-estimation; and to this source we may trace that heterogeneous mixture of pride, vanity, covetousness of new and strange things, that mildness and ferocity, fickleness, and good and kind disposition, which they exhibit. They are affectionate husbands and parents; and although the younger and more vigorous chiefs supersede the aged in their authority over the tribe, the latter are respected and their counsel listened to. The tribes more removed from European intercourse are hospitable; and this virtue was once common to all. In the interior a stranger, whether European or native, is always received with welcome; food and shelter are soon prepared for him. With their friends and relations they divide every thing they possess. A desire of instructing themselves, and a spirit of curiosity, pervade young and old. They are very attentive to tuition, learn quickly, and have a good memory. In attention to the objects which surround, in quickness of perception, they are superior in general to the white man. The spirit of curiosity leads them often to trust themselves to small coasting vessels, or they go with whalers to see more distant parts of the world. They adapt themselves readily to European navigation and boating, and at this moment a native of New Zealand is master of a whale-ship, and in Cook's Straits many boats are manned by them alone. On their first intercourse with Europeans, the natives always manifest a degree of politeness which would do honour to a more civilized people. They dislike to converse standing; and if we do so, they think we are not paying the necessary attention to themselves or to the subject. But their temper often changes very quickly; and a fickleness of character appears; a change from good to bad humour, often without any imaginable cause, which, especially when travelling, is very disagreeable. But if this irritability of temper is met with firmness, they suppress it; and, indeed, it is often put on to see how the European will bear it. *If they are treated with honesty, and with that respect which is due to them as men, I have always found them to reciprocate such treatment; and I have travelled amongst them with as much pleasure and security as I have in European countries.*"—Vol. ii. pp. 107—109.

That in their wars the natives are cruel and savage, and in their revenge treacherous and selfish, is not to be denied; but in peace they are far different, and their self-esteem may easily be turned to a means of their civilization. At present they have far from profited by their acquaintance with the white man. The missionary, earnest, enthusiastic, but generally weak and ignorant, or the mammon-loving speculator, or outcast from other settlements, have, until very lately, been the sole specimens of Europeans with whom they have been intermingled. The missionary has too often destroyed old social habits and qualities by his indiscriminating condemnation of savage life, whilst the other Europeans have been to the natives schoolmasters of covetousness, suspicion, and importunateness. We may look for better things now that both the Church and the State have competent leaders—men who will carefully consider the habits and character of the native before they attempt to legislate between him and the colonist: who will bear in mind the native's idea of the contract when he sold the land to the colonist, and remember the conflicting interests of tribes, the independence of the freemen, as

well as the recognised power of the chief. The savage is generally willing to admit the claim of any person who comes and buys the land and settles on it himself; but he cannot understand how one man can buy for another thousands of miles from him; and why, because he has sold to John Smith the right of tilling a certain portion of the land, he is to give it up to Andrew Fisk, because the said Andrew has paid so much to the said John, and both have signed a parchment in an unknown language. We are very fond of boasting of our superior civilization, and laying it down as an incontrovertible axiom that the savage cannot be incorporated with the white man, and that gradual driving back, and eventually extermination, is the lot of the aborigines on whose land we may intrude. Of a surety the fate of the savage in days past is a proof of the powers of civilization over savage life, the superiority of the musket and the "spirit-flask" over the club and the water-of the savage; whilst the deficiency of our civilization, our moral government, is thus demonstrated as incapable of amalgamating savage simplicity and virtue with European civilization, but driven to root up the wheat with the tares.

The late letters from the Bishop show the interest taken by the natives in the progress of religion. When he administered the eucharist at Nelson for the first time, the attendance of the natives was most encouraging, and after the service, one of them came to the Bishop and said, that having seen the English give money, he also wished to give something; upon which he produced eighteenpence as his contribution to the church shortly to be erected at the settlement. On the 7th of May, last year, the Bishop opened, previous to consecration, the new church of St. Paul, at Auckland, then in an unfinished state. Two native and two English services were performed on that day. "The services," says the Bishop, "began with a native congregation at nine, some of whom having only heard of the opening on Saturday evening, paddled a distance of twelve miles by sea, during the night, in order to be present. The greater number were in full European clothing, and took part in the Church service in a manner which contrasts most strikingly with that of the silent and unknéeing congregations of the English settlers." We have already spoken of the manner in which the Bishop was received by the settlers at New Plymouth—a settlement, says the Bishop, in his last letter to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, "that pleased me much by its honest agricultural character, and the absence of any attempt to appear what it is not and cannot be." We do not fear but that the Devonshire emigrants will maintain the high character awarded them by their Bishop, and make the most of those privileges they so much desired, and he so readily extended to them. The following extract from the same letter, shows that the Bishop agrees with us in regarding New Zealand as the yeoman's colony:—

"The plan of the Society, in furnishing me with the means of educating young men for the ministry, has given me the greatest comfort and hope during

the many losses which we have sustained. If it can be carried on, I trust in God that we shall never want a supply of men to fill the numerous village stations into which the population of this country will soon be divided. The great towns, which a temporary expenditure of capital forced into existence, cannot, I think, be expected to increase; but I look forward to the cantonment of a healthy, and I trust a godly population, in every beautiful little valley, and by the side of every running stream, of which there are hundreds in every part of the islands. To supply these country curacies, for they will be nothing more, we must have men bred on the spot—men of simple piety, and simple habits—accustomed to live at small expense, and acquainted with all the little difficulties—for privations there are none—of a colonial life in New Zealand."

Let us now conclude with thanks to those friends who have given us so much assistance in this work, to those publishers who have freely lent their latest books, and to the Society, by whose kindness we are enabled to prefix to our article a map of the Diocese of New Zealand, at once explaining and enhancing the value of our lucubrations. And whilst we express our pleasure at the increased contributions which the late appeal of the heads of our Church has brought to the funds of the Propagation Society, let us warn Churchmen that they must not stop as yet; that all over our colonies the Church is daily crying out to this Society for help, and that the faith of the Society is not only pledged to those missionaries who have gone forth to distant lands in dependence on its promises, to those colonists who receive from it the boon of Church ministrations, but is pledged to go forward with the spread of our colonial empire, and to follow at the heel of the back-woodsman.

The New Examination for Divinity Degrees. Some Hints as to the Character of the Statute now proposed to Convocation. Oxford: Baxter. London: Rivingtons; Burns. 8vo.

AFTER many turnings and shiftings, and fluctuations of counsel, the new Divinity Statute has at length been fairly re-issued and launched forth by the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford. We have now the *ultimatum* of that Board. They do not, from this time, recede one step; and, in the shape in which the Statute now stands, it will be brought into convocation on the 2d of May next.

This re-issued Statute is, in all but one or two points, exactly the same with the first-issued one. The only alteration to speak of is, the omission of the clause respecting the delivery into the Professor's hands, of the copies of the exercises. This has been given up, as the marked retention of all the rest of the Statute shows, not out of any good-will to convocation, or any intention of really modifying the purport of the Statute; but from the sheer necessity of conceding something or other to the loud and general opposition which was made. A mistake had

been made in sending out the Statute in the form they did; and they must cover that mistake as well as they can. The Regius Professor is accordingly clipped of the power of demanding copies of the exercises. This may be annoying to Dr. Hampden personally, inasmuch as he actually made the claim in the case of Mr. Macmullen, and is therefore clearly put in the wrong, as far as that act is concerned, by this Statute. The denial of this claim is a decided reflection upon him for having made it. But the *animus* of the Statute itself is not altered in consequence. The Regius Professor is now told that he must manage without the *litera scripta*, and make the sharper use of his ears instead. The latter is not so convenient an organ for the purpose: still, if he does hear anything stated in the course of the dissertation which he chooses to consider erroneous, and reports it to the Vice-Chancellor, the re-issued Statute retains the whole of the rest of the machinery for squashing the Candidate's degree, in as full force as the first-issued one did. "Si quid dubii occurrat," says the re-issued Statute, "*de formâ aut modo exercitiorum præstandorum*;" instead of—as it stood in the first one—"in exercitiis præstandis." This is all the difference it makes; and the difference really amounts to nothing at all. The one phrase is just as ambiguous and comprehensive as the other. If the "*aut*" here is copulative, and the "*modo*" is to be understood as additional to the "*formâ*," anything may be brought under the head of the *mode* "*exercitiorum præstandorum*," doctrinal points, as well as others; *i. e.* anything may be so brought by a Vice-Chancellor, who chooses so to interpret the phrase; which is the main thing practically to consider. If such points do occur, if the Professor hears anything he dislikes, he has only to say that he is not satisfied with the *mode* "*exercitiorum præstandorum*," and immediately—for here even verbal difference ends—"dubium illud statim ad Vice-Cancellarium deferetur cujus in hac re sententia rata et definitiva habebitur." In such case still, as a pamphlet asserted of the first Statute, "the Candidate can only appeal from one individual functionary of the University to another; from the Regius Professor to the Vice-Chancellor. In all such cases of dispute, between the Candidate and the Professor,—for the clause "*si quid dubii forte occurrat de—modo exercitiorum præstandorum*" [we put it in the altered form] may be taken to include such cases—the Candidate is referred to the Vice-Chancellor. There is nothing said about the Vice-Chancellor's court; he is referred to the individual Vice-Chancellor, and the latter's sentence is to be complete, decisive, and final; *rata et definitiva*. Take the case, then, of a difference between the Regius Professor and the Candidate on a doctrinal statement in the latter's dissertation, which he conscientiously

adheres to. It is referred to the Vice-Chancellor. If the Vice-Chancellor agrees with the Regius Professor, upon the theological decision of these two, without farther appeal, the candidate is precluded from taking his degree.

The fact of this objection having been made so expressly as it was to this part of the statute, makes the vagueness and the ambiguity of the alteration here the more suspicious. It was said expressly and distinctly—your phrase “in exercitiis præstandis” is a most formidably inclusive one. We do not object to the appeal being to the Vice-Chancellor in the mere matter of *subjects* for exercises; to his interfering between the Regius Professor and the Candidate, simply to see that the former takes and approves of fair unobjectionable subjects when they are proposed to him. But this phrase “in exercitiis præstandis” means a great deal more than this. Alter this: show that you do not mean anything doctrinal to come in here. Prevent that doctrinal ground from coming in. Preclude the Regius Professor and the Vice-Chancellor from doctrinal decisions. This objection was distinctly made in this way, and now the Hebdomadal Board, fully understanding what alteration was wanted, can yet only alter their “exercitiis præstandis” to the “*de modo exercitiorum. præstandorum.*” Things certainly may be said where they are wished to be said. There are words in the Latin language which could easily have expressed, and accurately enough, the alteration desired. Nothing could have been easier than to have said, in so many words, that doctrine was *not* to be decided on by the Vice-Chancellor. This is not said, and the marked way in which the alteration which is made evades the whole design of an alteration, and alters nothing but the words, only stamps its obnoxious meaning upon that part of the Statute more significantly and forcibly.

Thus, though with some mortification to Dr. Hampden personally, the power of the Vice-Chancellor and the Regius Professor, acting together, to stop a divinity degree, is ultimately retained in this re-issued Statute. Also, the whole of that most vast and formidable machinery involved in the compulsory examination before the Professorial Board, is retained without even a verbal alteration. In short, to speak summarily, the re-issued Statute is the same as the first one.

So much for this part of the Statute. To proceed now to the latter-mentioned, and far by the most important, part—the subject of the examination before the Professorial Board.

This whole new Statute, we must observe, professed to be introduced into convocation for a particular definite purpose. It was not brought on *apropos* to nothing at all. It did not call itself a general Statute for the alteration of all theological arrangements in the University, or profess to put forward any grand general principle of reform in this department. Cir-

cumstances imperatively called for some statute or other, to settle the respective claims of the Professor of divinity and the Candidate of divinity, with respect to the latter's exercises in the schools. An instance had occurred, which had riveted the attention of the University upon this particular point. The Regius Professor had made a claim upon a Candidate for a divinity degree, which was resisted: the consequence of which was, that the Regius Professor would not present him. The University Court was appealed to, and not a step was gained towards deciding the dispute; though it was perfectly clear that the Candidate had the unrepealed Statutes of the University on his side all along. Here then was a particular definite point, that of the B. D. exercises in the divinity schools, which was to be settled. There could not be a clearer and more definite object for any Statute that was ever made in the world. A particular matter in dispute called for it; and it had that particular matter to settle, and nothing else. It professed to be, and everybody expected it to be, a simple Statute to arrange the management of the B. D. exercises in the divinity schools.

The Statute, when it came out, certainly did settle this point, among others: that is not to be denied. It settled it pretty summarily, in the way in which we have mentioned. But what did persons find, when they looked into it, but, tacked to this subject of the Exercises in the Schools, a huge, immense alteration in the whole theological department in the University, which had nothing at all to do with these Exercises, and was not, in the slightest degree, called for by any connexion with the recent dispute? Members of Convocation found that, besides the subject in hand, they had another and a totally different subject, suddenly thrown upon their consideration, for which they were wholly unprepared. The Hebdomadal Board had abstained from giving a hint about this the most important half of the Statute. It came before the University, stuck and pasted on to the natural and expected part of the Statute, about the B. D. exercises, just in the way in which any one subject may be fastened on to any other, if persons so choose. Each was fully entitled to a separate consideration; and why the Board should have put them together, and made Siamese twins of them, it is difficult to conceive any valid, straightforward reason.

This other part of the Statute institutes a regular new examination, and a new degree in theology, previous to that of B. D. It makes it absolutely necessary for a person to pass through this examination, and to take this degree, before he advances to that of B. D. This new degree is called that of "Candidate in Theology." Both the examination and the title it confers are borrowed from the Professorial Statute of 1842. But mark the difference. There they were *voluntary*; now

they are made *compulsory*. This examination was allowed, two years ago, to pass through Convocation, on the understanding that it was, and was to be, a purely voluntary one. No active opposition at all was made to it at the time, purely on this account. It passed in the quiet way it did, simply in consequence of its being left voluntary. The Hebdomadal Board must know very well that, had they made it a compulsory one then, it would have excited the strongest opposition. However, under this form it passed; and now, the very first occasion that brings the Board across the Divinity department is made use of to convert the voluntary examination into a compulsory one. This point, however, is sufficiently explained, in the following paper:—

“ THE NEW DEGREE OF CANDIDATE IN THEOLOGY.

“ ‘ Titulo CANDIDATORUM IN SACRA THEOLOGIA insigniti.....’
Professorial Statute of 1842.

“ ‘ Statutum est, quod is, qui ad Gradum Baccalaurei in S. Theologia promoveri cupit, priusquam pro gratia sua supplicet, in *Schedulam Candidatorum* ab Examinatoribus in Sacra Theologia redigetur.’—*Proposed New Statute.*

“ In addition to that part of the New Divinity Statute which is immediately concerned with the process of taking the Divinity Degree, and with the Recitation in the Schools, a prior and more fundamental part should be considered. This is the institution of the new Degree of Candidate in Theology, which is imposed henceforth on all who look forward to taking their B.D., and which new degree is to be obtained by a regular formal examination enforced for that purpose.

“ We may call it the New *Degree* of Candidate in Theology, because, although it is not called a degree in the Statute, and although it has no fresh gown appropriated to it, it contains all the essentials of a degree. The distinguishing mark of a degree in such a case is the necessity of taking it. If, for example, the Degree of B.A. was not called a degree, and retained the commoner's gown, still the academical necessity under which the undergraduate lay with respect to taking it, would constitute it a degree.

“ The particular selection of the term ‘Candidate’ as the name of this degree, so far indeed from expressing this fact, seems to imply the reverse. For a person is ordinarily called a candidate, not when he has got any privilege or honour, but when he is trying for it; and the term dates prior, and not posterior, to success. In this case, however, the order is reversed, and the person, after he has undergone his examination, and had his name put on the schedule as having passed, is called for the first time a ‘Candidate.’ It is only necessary here to remember, that, whatever be the primary signification of the word ‘Candidate,’ it signifies here one who has passed the examination in hand, and so is the name truly and essentially of a new degree. And whereas a Master of Arts now proceeds straight to his B.D. without any intermediate step, he would, according to this Statute, have to pass, or have passed through, the Degree of Candidate in Theology, in addition.

“ This new obligatory arrangement was the more unlooked for, because in the Professorial Statute of 1842, this examination was expressly made a voluntary one:—‘*quicumque se examinandos sistere velint*’—a person could either enter it or not, as he pleased. It was not brought into the *system*; it was introduced as a mere side offer to any who chose from time to time to take advantage of it, as a stimulus or help to their own private reading. It stood a

simple *παρεργον* on the part of such as submitted themselves to it, and was in this respect no more than any private examination that a person might ask his own friends to give him.

"It is plain that the whole nature of such an examination, and its whole bearing upon our University system, is changed the instant it is thus made compulsory. The difference between its being voluntary and compulsory makes not only a difference, but all the difference. For though it may be said that when such an examination has been instituted, its institution in the first instance at all, even in its voluntary shape, was the change, and that the difference between making it voluntary and compulsory is only one of degree—such an argument is absurd. A voluntary examination is one thing; a compulsory examination is another thing. The former, from the very fact of its being voluntary, is no regular part of our system; the latter becomes a regular formal part of the University system. The distinction which a voluntary examination confers is a mere honour; the distinction which a compulsory one confers is a *degree*. Not two persons out of a hundred might attend the voluntary examination: every one of those hundred will have to attend the compulsory one.

"Suppose any examination whatever instituted, that undergraduates might attend if they pleased merely for the advantage of trying their own powers. It is obvious such an examination might go on without committing the University system. But make this compulsory before the regular Examination for B.A., and we make, in fact, another degree antecedent to that of B.A. The undergraduate who passed, we might call a 'CANDIDATE IN ARTS,' or we might give him no name at all. It would not signify; the degree so conferred would be to all intents and purposes an Academical Degree.

"It is plain, then, by making the examination before the Theological Board compulsory instead of voluntary, that we introduce an entirely new degree into the University. Now consider some of the practical effects of such a change.

"A person who wants to take his B.D. is compelled by this Statute to reside a whole year in the University, after his B.A., attending the Divinity Lectures. This is not mentioned in the new Statute, and might escape observation. The new Statute, however, makes the insertion of the name in the Theological Schedule necessary for the B.D.: the Professorial Statute of 1842 makes the year's residence and attendance on the Lectures necessary* for the insertion in the Schedule. Put these two together.

"Now this compulsory year's residence, in addition to the present academical period, may not be inconvenient to some persons; but to others, who will have quite the same right to take their B.D., it may be, and to a certainty will be, extremely inconvenient. The mere expenditure of so much time is a great demand to make. A person down in the country may be partially supporting himself and reading theology at the same time; here he will be reading theology simply; he cannot depend on getting pupils unless he happens to have taken a high class. So one year (for three Terms sufficiently cut up a year) is fairly taken out of his resources. Add to this, the great expenses of an academical residence, and the unwillingness on the part of parents, after they have been going on three years or more, answering all pecuniary calls, to continue the domestic drain for another year.

"The result will probably be, that only those to whom this residence may happen to be quite convenient, will ever reside the year, and that others will be obliged not to think of taking their B.D. at all. And this seems to be unfair. The University ought to make a distinction here. It is one thing to offer those future B.D.s, who are able to reside, certain benefits in the way of Divinity Lectures and an examination; and another thing to disqualify those for the B.D. who are not able to reside, or avail themselves of such advantages. It is possible to benefit one party, without injuring another; to

* Nullus Scholaris se Examinandum sistet nisi—sex ad minimum lectionum Theologicarum seriebus attentum se auditorem præstiterit.—Cautio semper ne quis plures quam duas series in quovis termino pro formâ audiat.

bestow a distinction, without inflicting a penalty; to make the Professorial Lectures so much clear gain to those who attend them, and attach no academical forfeiture to those who do not. The Professorial Statute very properly made or implied this distinction, the new Statute undoes it again.

"This is one practical effect, then, of making an arrangement compulsory which *was* voluntary. The voluntary one could of course inconvenience nobody; persons would make use of it according as it suited their situations, and not otherwise. It adapts itself to their circumstances. When made compulsory, on the other hand, persons must square their circumstances to it; and inconvenience and awkwardness begin to be felt.

"Another practical effect of this change has reference to the Theological test, which such an examination cannot fail to apply to those who undergo it. A regular Paper Examination before a formal Board of Theological Examiners, in which doctrine of all kinds comes in, can hardly fail to test the doctrinal opinions of those who undergo it, and so far must operate as a doctrinal test. It is not easy to conceive how it can do otherwise.

"Now the difference between a compulsory and voluntary examination, is on this head a most exceedingly important difference. A doctrinal test may be of most forcible and searching application to those who come under it, but it is of none at all to those who do not. And so, where it is left optional to come under it or not, it is obviously not chargeable with any exclusive or narrowing tendencies. A voluntary doctrinal test is, indeed, a most mild and unobjectionable one. But make it compulsory, and we immediately make a totally different thing of it. A test is no test which people may submit to or not as they please: it is its compulsoriness which constitutes it a test.

"This, then, is what the New Statute does. The Professorial Statute of 1842 certainly instituted a new theological examination; but left it perfectly 'voluntary,' and outside of the regular academical system. This, if it was not intended to be carried further, was a moderate and judicious plan. It gave advantages to some, and caused inconveniences to nobody. The New Statute now proposed, however, far outruns that of 1842, and goes even directly counter to the spirit of the latter, if that spirit is to be judged of from its letter and surface. There cannot be a greater change than to alter an examination from being a purely voluntary, into a compulsory one. The principle of compulsion, when introduced, becomes immediately the prominent and all-important principle in the matter. And though, in the present case, the examination itself, and the Examining Board, may be only continued from the Statute of 1842, the fact of its being compulsory makes it a wholly different affair. The simple change of making it compulsory converts it into a very great practical inconvenience, and into a searching doctrinal test, whereas, in its voluntary state, it could have been neither the one nor the other."

But this new examination, and this new degree, only betray their real meaning and character when seen in connexion with the Board which controls them. The Board at whose absolute disposal this new degree is placed, and before whom this examination is passed, are chosen from the Divinity Professors, with the exception of one, who is appointed by the Vice-Chancellor. All these Divinity Professors, except the Lady Margaret's, are appointed by Government. Thus the first theological degree—the necessary stepping-stone to the other two, the key which opens the whole department of Divinity to the University-student—is put in the hands of a small body of Government nominees; and ministerial influence occupies the very entrance into the most sacred precincts of the University. A letter, signed S.,

which appeared some time back in *The Times*, most ably exposes this part of the statute :—

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

“SIR,—I am aware that I ask a favour in begging insertion at this busy time of the year for a letter on so dull a subject as the proposed Oxford statute. I am induced to do so because, warmly concurring in the tenor of a late able article of yours upon that subject, I cannot but think it omitted a very material feature in the question.

“In 1842 a University statute was passed, creating two new Theological Professors, and constituting them, with the two who already existed and the Regius Professor of Hebrew, a board for lecturing and examining theological students. One other professor, to be nominated under Dr. Ireland's will by the heads of houses, was subsequently added with similar powers.

“‘Scholars’ in theology, subsequently to their Bachelor of Arts degree, were to attend six courses of lectures, to be delivered by one or other of these gentlemen, and a year's residence at the University; and at the end of the year they were to pass an examination which was to entitle them to the style of ‘candidates in sacred theology.’

“Two of the examiners were to be appointed by the professors out of their own number—one by the Vice-Chancellor from the graduates in theology.

“The effect of this was to constitute a fresh kind of theological degree, given, not by the University, or by any person or persons directly or indirectly appointed by the University, but virtually by the six professors, four of whom are to be nominated by the Crown, and five, if I am not very much indeed mistaken, are to be canons of Christ Church.

“Some long-sighted persons felt an objection to this statute at the time, but it was not pressed. It was probably thought that this Crown degree in theology, conformable by the canons of Christ Church, being perfectly voluntary, the old University degrees of B.D. and D.D. being still open, and the hands of the bishops unfettered, the title of ‘candidate’ would derive its value from the character and proceedings of the board who conferred it—would find its own level—would rise or fall in the estimation of the bishops and clergy in proportion to the orthodoxy and learning for which it was found to be a guarantee, and so that it would be factious to press an objection against the creation of an honourable title, which no one need trouble himself to acquire unless he chose, and which would confer no credit unless it deserved to do so.

“The very title of ‘*candidates*’ should perhaps have warned the University that the heads of houses intended more than met the eye. It had not, however, that effect; and its meaning is now first disclosed by a very little clause in the new statute. It is here proposed, that every one before he aspires to the academical degree of B.D. ‘*in schedulam candidatorum* ab examinadoribus in sacra theologia redigetur.’ This Crown or Christ Church title of honour, and a year's attendance upon the theological lectures of the professors, are made a *sine qua non* of the regular university degree. The power of conferring degrees in theology, and by implication of fixing authoritatively and *compulsorily* the religious creed of the University, is virtually vested in these canons of Christ Church.

“I can scarcely doubt that this is but a *specimen* of the purposes to which this convenient machinery is to be turned. But, taking it merely upon its own merits, can the members of the University submit to it?

“In the first place, it excludes for ever from the degree of Bachelor or Doctor in Divinity (at least in the regular course) all who, from poverty or any other cause, have been unable, as young men, to afford an additional year's residence in the University. Men cannot, in maturer life, break off their fixed occupations to spend this period at Oxford, and pass an examination like boys before the board of professors. It must be done immediately on taking their degree or never; and a young man whose family is needy, or whose time is valuable, cannot then afford it.

"Again, though I should be very sorry to revive college jealousies, now happily dormant, and am quite aware that a large proportion (perhaps, as now, the majority) of future professors will not have been originally Christ Church-men, yet I do think that this power, given to the foundation of a single college over a matter which is wholly of academical jurisdiction, is most mischievous and unjust. The Chris-Church canons, in the nature of things, will probably form more or less of a clique, from whatever college they may have been originally selected; and to the mercies of a clique university degrees should never be committed.

"These are two important objections, but they are far inferior in weight (at least to my own apprehension) to this more broad and real one—that the statute furnishes a machinery for destroying the independence of the University in its most precious point.

"Whatever may be thought of the disputations before the Regius Professor, it is obvious that the proposed examination will be a *test of religious opinion as well as proficiency*. It ought to be so—it must be so—and of course it will be so. And what are the hands into which it is proposed to commit for ever the power of excluding what they choose to call erroneous opinions from theological degrees?

"The majority of the examiners (two to one) are appointed by the professors; the majority of the professors (also two to one) are appointed by the Prime Minister; the Prime Minister is forced on the Crown by the majority of the House of Commons, and the House of Commons is elected by the constituency as created by the Reform Bill. The connexion between the extremities of this chain is not very immediate, but it is not the less certain. The one will surely and eventually, though not suddenly, colour the other. I will not quite say, in Sir Robert Peel's famous words, that the theological faculty of Oxford will have 'to fight the battle of orthodoxy in the registration courts,' though even this would be no very inexcusable hyperbole. But I will say that the proposed statute, joined with that of 1842, bears every appearance of a deliberate, if not clandestine, design to invest the Prime Minister of England with the greatest practicable power over the religious faith of the University.

"The attempt, if successful, might be—though I do not at all think it would be—harmless for the present. But the great question regards the future. And if the gentlemen who propose it will but carry their memories back to the time, not twelve years past, when the spirit which they now call heresy had not yet roused the Church into that energy by which they and the whole Conservative party are now profiting, but the spirit and heart of which they are suicidally attempting to eradicate—if they will but remember the days when parsons were pelted, and the Premier told bishops to set their houses in order, and will reflect that what has been may be—nay, may very easily indeed, become the permanent state of England (especially if they trouble themselves to silence all counteracting influences), they will surely feel that it is not the wisest thing in the world for the University to tie itself down in the same boat as the House of Commons, and to condemn its theological faculty to a progress in liberalism proportionate, however remotely, to that made by the 10*l.* householders.

"Surely the University which rose as one man to resist Parliamentary interference, when proposed by a Whig Cabinet, will not allow its life and power to be stolen away from it by the legislation of the Hebdomadal Board, and the powers inherent in the whole body of Convocation to be practically transferred to a single foundation (it is no offence to add) of Ministerial nominees.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant, S."

We certainly cannot conceive anything more unfortunate happening to an English University, than that it should slide, in this way, into the grasp of the Government of the day. We see enough of this centralizing tendency on all sides and in all departments now; do not let it be carried on into our Uni-

versity system; let the theological atmosphere of our universities be at any rate free from it. If this last stronghold of old, genuine religious thought and feeling gives way, we see not what is to check the nation in its latitudinarian progress. Hitherto, amid the general looseness of opinion that has spread, and the break-up of old systems, and the wide waste and the sea, the nation has instinctively felt the moorings that have been left her. She has heard within her a warning voice, and a note which did not follow the leading of the age. The Universities have been her inland theological forts, where the good elements in her religious character have taken refuge, and concentrated their strength, and been enabled to hold out against the general disaffection around them. Talk to any Liberal of the day of our national state of feeling now, and what its tendencies are, and what prevents the march of mind from advancing at that rate at which it has done in some continental countries, and he will point to the Universities. They are the check, and the clog, in the wheel of Liberalism. They pertinaciously decline uniting with the general movement of the mass. They are talked at, and attempted to be talked down; the parliamentary sneer is levelled at them; and the politician looks envious, and commissions are threatened. In the meantime, Oxford stands indubitably a Mordecai in the gate: she does not bow to the Liberal as he passes. She stands stiff, bolt upright; to Whig and Conservative she is the same, when Whig or Conservative interfere with her. Sir Robert Peel made his choice fifteen years ago, and took upon the Emancipation question the Liberal line. Oxford had no objection to Sir Robert Peel,—she liked him; but, when he took this line she discarded him.

This is what our Universities differ in so much from the German Universities,—and most advantageously. The German Universities are under the immediate eye of the administration; they receive their professors from thence, and are kept under the same kind of *surveillance* to which the civil departments are subject. This intimate connexion with the Central Government connects them with the ruling genius and party in the nation for the time being. They become the receptacles of prevalent theories, and take their colour and tone from the state of the national mind, whatever that may be, and follow all its sinuosities and caprices and transitions. They represent the nation, rather than teach it. The English Universities, with not half of the spirit of deep inquiry and research that distinguishes the foreign Universities, take a much higher position than the latter do. They teach with the voice of authority, and tell men what is true, and what is not. While the German bodies are losing themselves in the depth and perplexity of their own speculations, the English ones lay down the law. The German

Universities are perpetually creating truth; the English are content with receiving it, as it has been handed down to them. They are in possession of a system which goes back to times of far sterner mould and fixed principle than the present: and they remain in the nation as the obdurate and still-living exemplars of the solid rock and foundation. They do so, because they stand by themselves,—because they are disconnected with the political system, and the State centre. Dependence upon Government forthwith brings on a dependence upon the general movements in society, and upon the caprices and changes of the national mind. Government is the centre and head-quarters of the national mind. The connexion with the centre involves the connexion with the whole system which comes to a head there. The Universities, when taken into the hands of Government, are sucked into the general mass; they are carried straight down the huge central absorbing throat, and immediately mingle with the popular mind, and are lost in the vague and indefinite national progress. Liberalism could gain no greater triumph than the admission of Government control into the Universities.

Look only at the bare surface and aspect which the interior of one of our Universities presents. How quietly, yet deeply anomalous and antiquated, do the old collegiate institutions, with their respective foundations—presidents and wardens, fellows and scholars, chaplains and clerks, show! Every College retaining the identical old Statute Book and Constitution that the founder gave it; every College electing its own head and fellows, managing its own manors and lands, and possessing within itself a monarchy and little state of its own. A picturesque scene most undoubtedly, most soothing and rural indeed! We should like to know how long it would continue if the power of the central government ever fairly got a-head in the University. Alas! the sheltered spot attracts now too many a scowl to doubt what would very soon become of it, if the common-place political world was allowed an ingress. Sad will be that day, if it ever comes, for our picturesque monumental scene. What cutting and squaring! What a level will be made of the collegiate mounds and slopes! How will the different fraternities very soon find themselves transferred from the irregular poetical group in which they now stand, into regimental or warehouse order! How will the old system loosen at one fell stroke of the centralizer's pen, and the old fabrics find themselves re-arranged in *dépôt-fashion*, with central apartments of the "resident governor," and office of superintending committee of education! We may be exaggerating. Certainly, however, some very great change of the levelling kind will follow, and some more modern basis will be given to the Universities as soon as ever parliament comes in.

And it is the first step to bringing in parliament, to bring in the government. What keeps parliament out is the old atmosphere of these places, and the peculiar respect which is felt in the country at large for them on that account. When government control comes in, this *prestige* goes. The Universities lose their old character, and fall a natural prey to political systematizers, and a tempting food for commissions. When the Universities become government departments, parliament will deal with them as such.

It is at any rate the part of prudence to oppose the first inroad of such a power, and stop up all avenues to such a change. And the inroad conceded in this statute to the Political power, is by no means so slight even in its present working. It is not a change merely prospectively and in tendencies: it is a great and very decided change now. The thin end of the wedge is far from imperceptible: whether or not the thick end is to come after, the thin end is thick enough in all conscience. It is a good big slice, for a first one, which is cut out of our University system, and handed over to the State. The State, as represented by its nominees, commands the entrance into the whole department of theology in the University.

We must say that, looking upon this movement of the Hebdomadal Board in all its bearings, it is one of the most serious and vital blows which has ever been aimed at the character and constitution of the University. And it comes most suitably and in character from that board from which the proposition for the admission of Dissenters, and so many other attempts in that line, have proceeded. This movement has all the appearance of proceeding from a full and strong determination to relax the old theological tone of the University by some means or other. Here is a whole political machinery, a whole government court of theology introduced, and introduced with all that look of plan and design which gradual and cautious introduction shows. In the progress of this statute we have, plainly, intentional veil and concealment at first, and a withdrawal of the veil afterwards, when the University is thought to have got so far accustomed to an idea in its elementary shape, as to bear it in the developed! The Examination was obviously introduced first in its voluntary shape, in order that it might escape suspicion, and pass. Two years afterwards, when the University is supposed to have forgotten that circumstance, and only to know in a vague way the fact that there is such a thing as a theological examination of some sort for those who go to be examined; then the proposal is made to make it a compulsory examination instead of a voluntary one: as if, forsooth, this were no alteration at all, and as if there were no difference to speak of between a thing being voluntary and compulsory.

We say here is design shown: one statute is made on purpose that another prospective statute, of the approach of which not a word is said, may be fitted on to it afterwards. This, now before us, is the statute which fits on to and gives the completion intended all along to the Professorial Statute of 1842. Schemes and plans are formidable things, and should be met. People should be, at any rate, aware that such schemes are in progress. We may leave the practical inference to be drawn by those members of Convocation who retain their interest in and love for their University, and are now able to assist her.

Most earnestly do we hope that the result of the Convocation, on the 2d of May, may show the world, that Oxford is not yet disposed to part with her old constitution and liberties. All who wish to see Oxford continue to be the Oxford she has been in times past, — all who wish there should continue, amid the general looseness, some spot or other of solid earth, on which a Churchman may stand, — should wish this statute to be thrown out. All who wish the Church of England *prestige* of two centuries, which as yet separates Oxford from the floating views of the day, to remain, should exert themselves against this undermining statute. Let Convocation maintain their academical *natale solum*. We have not too much of such soil in our nation; we cannot afford to give up what we have of it; we cannot afford to let Oxford slip under a government or parliamentary control. Members of the University are bound by their simple *esprit de corps*, if for no other reason, to guard against such an act of surrender. No call of late years exceeds in importance, if it equals, the call made by Oxford at the present crisis.

-
1. *The Book of Common Prayer, with Plain-tune. Part Second, containing the Psalter, Burial Service, and Appendix.* London: Burns. 1844.
 2. *The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland, &c. By the Rev. JOHN JEBB, A.M. &c.* London: Parker. 1843.
 3. *The Order of Daily Service, &c., as arranged by THOMAS TALLIS. Edited by JOHN BISHOP.* London: R. Cox and Co. 1843.
 4. *Laudes Diurnæ. The Psalter, &c.; with the Gregorian Tones.* London: Toovey. 1843.

A FRIEND of ours, when on a visit, not long since, to an ancient archiepiscopal city of the north, was highly entertained by the accounts he received of the discordant state of feeling among

the dignitaries of the cathedral respecting a certain ceremonial observance. Not, indeed, that the subject in dispute was matter of ridicule, but the manner of the disputants, and the fact that, in the very strong-hold of laxity—the place in which, beyond all others, the ordinances of the Church are lightly esteemed, and her rubrical directions disobeyed—they should have fixed upon a point about which, to say the least, a certain degree of doubt is admitted to exist. It seemed as if, in punishment of their laxity in other respects, they had been suffered to bring themselves into contempt by their contentions about the “tithe of mint,” while the very contentions served to open people’s eyes to the “weightier matters of the law,” which they neglected.

The case was this:—it appears that part of the church furniture consists of a pair of large altar candlesticks, with *tin candles, painted white*. These it had been customary to place on the altar on Communion-days; and, till very recently, nobody dreamt of objecting to the custom. The salvers and patens, chalices and flagons, and the candlesticks, were, on great festivals, displayed, and were esteemed to be highly ornamental. One paten, chalice, and flagon, to be sure, were for use, but the rest were ornamental; and why not? Large salvers and candlesticks are handsome things; private gentlemen are wont to exhibit their stores of plate on festal occasions, why should not capitular bodies do the same? There seemed to be no reason why they should not. But, alas! for the candlesticks and tin candles! Some high-Churchman hinted that their right to be placed upon the altar arose, not from their ornamental qualifications, but from their mystical significancy of the “true light of the world.” Here was a coil; the hitherto innocent candlesticks, and still more guiltless tin candles, became criminals and apostates: they ceased to be Protestant candlesticks! Hitherto, they were dumb images, that said nothing—meant nothing; “story they had none to tell;” but now the breath of life was breathed into them, and they vented flat popery. The tin candles now burnt with an invisible blue flame of popery. This was not to be borne: the candlesticks must be removed at all hazards; but here the strife began. Some of the dignitaries pulled one way, some another; some contended for the customary display of candlesticks as a custom; some contended for the custom as significant; some objected to the custom altogether, whether it were old or new—significant or non-significant. “It is a foolish old relic of popery, which ought to be swept away,” cries one; “it is scarcely harmless, if you deprive it of its original meaning—positively pernicious, if you attempt to revive the meaning.” “Nay,” replies another, “the custom is not popish, but Anglican, and the meaning is Catholic, and ought never to have been forgotten. I vote for real candles, instead of the

sham ones." "What my friend says about Catholic meaning, and all that, is quite true," rejoins a third, the *safe man* of the party—"quite true that we have forgotten many things that ought to have been remembered; but we must not alarm people. I think, therefore, the candlesticks ought just to remain where they are, and as they are. In truth, if I were to sanction their removal, I should offend my friend here, with whom I quite agree as to Catholic practice, and so forth; but as the candles, being made of tin, are not very directly significant, we ought to be satisfied that nothing popish is meant. However, I see no objection to each of you following out, so far as may be, his own wishes." The result was, that the appearance of the candlesticks on the altar came to be contingent on residence and non-residence. Sometimes they are supposed to be innocent ornaments, having no meaning whatever; sometimes they signify as much as tin and white paint will allow them; and sometimes they remain secreted in the Sacristy. The absolute objectors gain their point by having liberty to lock them up at such times as it falls to their lot to officiate. The advocates of the custom, as a custom, have it in their power to say, "My good people, don't imagine that there is here the least suspicion of popery; for though these look like popish candles, a nearer inspection will convince you that they are thoroughly Protestant; they are only sham ones." And the high-Churchman, satisfied that, whether real or sham, they are intended to appear real, contents himself, as he best may, with an apparent adherence to Catholic usage, accompanied, though it be, with a protest against popery, in the shape of tin and white paint.

It may be thought that too many words have been wasted on such a subject; but is not this a story in little—an epitome—a caricature of the actual conflict of parties now proceeding on all matters that relate to the service and ordinances of the Church? The parallel, we fear, is so exact, that it is difficult to avoid recognizing in the termination of this petty dispute, a too sure prognostic of the *practical* settlement of questions of far greater moment. In truth, wherever we turn, whatever be the matter controverted, the same threefold division of party manifests itself; the same conflict takes place, and, for all that now appears, there is too much ground for anticipating in every case the same abortive conclusion. Between two sections of the contending parties, there is an earnest and (on one side, at least) an honest warfare. Of the two, one contends for the development of the Church system, such as the Church herself designed it to be; the other, for its development according to their own views; but a third section starts up, proclaims that the disputants are representatives of extreme opinions, and takes upon itself the plausible office of mediation. This we fear is the class who will carry

the day. They have the unenquiring world with them; because they possess, in appearance, the qualities which are esteemed in the conduct of human affairs—prudence, caution, considerateness, deliberation. Talk to a man of this class of the grievous practical defects of the Church, he will join with you in lamenting them; show him to how great an extent the Catholic elements of the Church system have been swamped by a flood of Protestantism and irreligion, he will concede with regret that it is too true; nay, he will descant with you on the theoretical beauty of the Anglican ritual system,—on the admirable manner in which apparently jarring materials have been so amalgamated as to constitute, if not a real, at least a practicable, *via media* between Popery and Protestantism: in short, he will go as far as you will in theory; but attempt to speak of reducing theory to practice, and he is gone. Urge upon him a reformation of present practice, and he straightway anchors himself on an infinity of exceptions arising out of the supposed exigency of the times; or he esconces himself under a shield on which he paints in such vivid colours the dangers of innovation, the dread of giving offence to tender consciences, and a thousand other considerations of a like nature, all addressed to the world's good opinion, by which he contrives to protect and justify himself in his immovable and impenetrable position.

It is, we confess, with much misgiving, that we recognise symptoms of the prevalence and increase of this tone of mind among those of the Clergy, especially, whose chances of preferment may be reckoned the most probable. What reasonable hope of reformation can remain to us, if the price of preferment be to stand tolerably well with all parties by means of a shuffling and trimming, the sole purpose of which is to avoid committal to the views of any? Is there the most remote prospect of straightforward and energetic conduct, such as the pressing necessity of the time requires, from men, the strength of whose position is maintained by theoretical agreement with Anglo-Catholic doctrine on the one side, and practical sufferance, and therefore sanction, of its denial on the other?

We have no wish, of course, to assert that prudence or considerateness are not qualities highly necessary and desirable in the Clergy, and more particularly in the prelates of the Church, or that there is not a real *via media*, which it is their bounden duty to pursue. Ever since the Reformation, there have been opposing elements in the Church of England, between which a middle course is to be steered; but the Church herself has pointed out the road. The Anglican system, undoubtedly, contains in it elements both of Catholicity and Protestantism, each of which is *abated* by the other. It presupposes the existence of two antagonist states of feeling; and not only so, but its right working was

probably designed to be secured by this very antagonism of individual bias, in the one direction and in the other. If, for example, in her Ordination services, the Church appears to uphold the absolute and independent character of sacerdotal power, she provides elsewhere for a very different view of the priestly office. She first makes it absolute, and then practically limits its exercise in a manner not dissimilar to that by which the monarchy of the Sovereign, though in theory absolute, is restricted in matters of temporal governance. And so in the case of the Sacraments: it requires no very acute discernment to recognise in one place an acknowledgment of the *opus operatum*; but the abridgment of the old doctrine is equally apparent in another. We can have no quarrel, therefore, with the Protestantism of one party, or the Catholicism of another, so long as their proceedings tend to develop the Church system as a whole; because it was intended as a whole to give scope to, while it amalgamated and restrained from excess, the very tendencies or tones of mind in which the antagonistic parties originate. It was for this very end that the Church herself chalked out a *via media* for us; for this, that her system is of the very nature of a middle course. It has in it throughout, an admixture of religious republicanism, *i. e.* of Protestantism; but the balance of interests, the adjustment of parties, has been struck by the Church herself. When your *safe* men, therefore, in the present state of things—*i. e.* the Church system,—the true *via media*, is not being carried out,—assume that the desires and views of those who are anxious to travel in the path made plain for them by the Church, are extreme views, which are to be kept in check by the sufferance of Protestant nonconformity; when they take up their position midway between the advocates of the Church system and its opponents; when they proclaim that by doing this they show themselves to be the wise men—the men to be trusted, fit to steer the bark of St. Peter; we admit that, in the present state of things, they have adopted a course which commends itself to the good opinion of the world; but it must be persisted in at the expense of honesty. In their endeavour to avoid committing themselves in one way, they have done so most fatally in another. They have committed themselves to a practical falsehood, by assuming that what is termed Anglo-Catholicism is an extreme, because in doing so they cannot avoid placing the Church system in the same category.

That there may be an extreme party on the Catholic side, we readily admit; that there is an ultra-Protestant one, nobody doubts; but neither the one nor the other can manifest itself otherwise than at the expense of the Church system. The middle men of the present time, therefore, if they obstruct the full operation of that system, must obstruct it either on the

one side or the other; if they hinder the development of its Catholic characteristics, their pretended *via media* is not in the middle, but on one side. However much they may approve of, and profess to admire, the Catholic theory of the Church, they are in practice anti-Catholic; and the result of their government, if to such they are called, must inevitably be obstructiveness, and the mere conservation of things as they are.

We say that, looking to the future with every hope for the best, it costs us many sad thoughts to watch the gradual widening and consolidation of this false and misnamed *via media*, and its acceptableness to the world. That it should be acceptable to the world is not to be wondered at; for it costs nothing: it is an easy way of holding high doctrines. But a lamentable prospect surely opens to us if people in general come to think that the doctrines of the Oxford school ought, somehow, to form part and parcel of the Anglican system, but only in theory; that the Clergy are, somehow or other, to believe them, but that an honest endeavour on their part to breathe life into them, would be so great evidence of imprudence, as to preclude all who have been accessory to such an attempt, from the hope of rising in the Church. If, in short, to acknowledge the Catholic theory of the Anglican system, and yet to hinder its practical development, be the course required of such as would retain the most remote chance of arriving at the prelacy, we have too much ground to dread that Providence has revived the nearly extinguished torch of truth only for our condemnation as a Church—too much ground to dread that a reformation on the whole is hopeless, and that the light afforded is intended to be a witness against us—a guide, indeed, to the individuals who are able to receive it, but, with respect to the whole Church, a witness whose testimony shall be overborne by the oily tongue of the prudence and wisdom of this world.

These observations, although suggested generally by the present posture of Church affairs, are not without considerable bearing on the subject now under our consideration. Church music, like every other ritual matter that is admitted to stand in need of reform, runs no little risk of being placed, after a deal of discussion, on a *safe footing*; i. e. of remaining as it was. Here, as in other cases, we have an illustration of the dispute about the candlesticks. Right-minded persons of taste become painfully alive to the degraded state of our choral service: they object to it; write against it; urge reformation on the parties concerned. By and by, as knowledge advances, their objections assume a more practical character. They point out the ancient and approved models to which the service ought to be conformed. They resolve the service into its elements, and for each of its component parts they prepare exemplars, manuals,

guide-books. At length, nothing seems wanting: every means have been adopted towards practical reform; and symptoms of amendment are just beginning to promise some reward to their labours, when up start the safe men with their extinguishers. They commence with their customary professions of agreement, not only with all that can be said in favour of reform, but with the means proposed to effect it; and having made their usual flourish of Catholicity and so forth, they conclude by showing us that, in present circumstances, nothing whatever should be done.

Two of the works placed at the head of this article afford a curious illustration of this course of events: the one, Mr. Dyce's edition of the Common Prayer, with plain-tune; the other, Mr. Jebb's Choral Service, or, rather, that part of it which relates to Gregorian music. The one professes to be the authorized manual, or Choral Book of the English Church, and, as such, to be the standard by which the plain-song of the service ought to be regulated, or, if need be, reformed. The other is a dissertation on the Choral Service, imbued almost throughout, but more particularly in those portions that treat of music, with every characteristic of the *safe* mode of viewing things. The one accordingly is a standard which the other admits in theory, but contrives to reject in practice. Of course, in thus speaking of Mr. Jebb's work, we must be understood to refer only to his remarks on music; for, with respect to the general structure of the service, the arrangement and due regulation of choirs and decorum in the performance of the divine offices, there is much valuable matter to be gleaned from his pages; for which we heartily thank him.

No sooner, however, does he touch on the more technical subject of music, than the clearness and straightforward accuracy by which his strictures on the general defects of cathedral arrangements are characterised, vanish, and, in their place, an indistinct, dissatisfied, querulous tone is assumed. He becomes discontented with everybody and everything; finds fault with modern usage, yet cannot suffer it to be amended; approves of ancient usage, yet will not allow it to be restored; blames the ancient because it is not modern, and the modern because it is not ancient. He is not very willing to have it imagined that any one preceded him in the discovery that plain-song had certain determinate rules,* yet when the discovery is made, he will neither apply the rules himself, nor permit any

* Mr. Jebb states that he had not seen Mr. Dyce's preface to the Musical Prayer-Book (in which these rules are for the first time within the last two centuries laid down) when the part of his work relating to the subject was written. But our readers will recollect a notice which appeared in this Review in 1841 (and which was copied into the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal), in which a description of these very rules was given from materials which we requested Mr. Dyce to furnish.

one else to do so. Though he informs us that in these days "decent order in the particular of sacred music is so deranged as to make the finding of any settled rule difficult, *nay, impossible*, were reference made to the present practice of the Church alone;" yet, on the rule being discovered in the matter of plain-song (and, as we have said, he is anxious to claim the merit of the discovery), he runs a tilt against Mr. Dyce, because he, guided by the rule, and fortified by the example of Tallis, had corrected a misprint or two in Marbeck. He affords us innumerable instances of variation in the plain-song of the service as it is now sung in cathedrals; and, although he only can affirm that they *are variations*, by having first ascertained *what they vary from* (and, indeed, he positively states that one of the choirs sets the "usual rules" at defiance), yet he allows no force whatever to the rules as correctives. On the contrary, he "suspects that there may be a good principle in this:" *i. e.* in disregard of the rules; "not," he continues, "that I would by any means recommend the disuse of the ancient responses: quite the contrary." Then, perhaps, he would recommend their use where they have been forgotten? Oh no, quite the contrary. His inference is, that "the uses of the different cathedrals (*i. e.* ancient responses, disregard of rules, &c., all included) ought to be religiously retained and preserved from any alteration, *which a deference to the ancient principles may suggest*, as it is very possible that their supposed irregularities may, in fact, be the assumption of some new and sound principle."

It certainly is a pity that Mr. Jebb was not present at our candlestick dispute in the north. *Mutatis mutandis*, his reasoning would have been an effectual preservative of the tin and white paint. "Judging," he might have said, "judging, my friends, by appearances, judging by what people generally consider to be wax candles, these may appear to be irregular; perhaps they are, perhaps not; I am not prepared to say. I admit that they ought to be made of wax; at least, they used to be so. The Catholic symbol seems to imply that they ought somehow to be candles; and if any other cathedrals have real wax candles, I would by no means recommend their disuse: quite the contrary; but as I think it just possible that our tin candles may conceal in the inside some new and sound principle, they ought to be religiously retained and preserved from any alteration which a deference to the ancient principles may suggest."

But to return. Shortly after the passage quoted above, Mr. Jebb proceeds: "Before concluding this section, it may be observed, that the setting of the clause, 'Favourably with mercy hear our prayers,' contains a curious evidence of the changes which have taken place in the pronunciation of the concluding word. In the ancient books, it has the *cadence proper to a dissyllable*, as it was formerly pronounced; while in the uses of

Winchester, Durham, and Westminster, that *proper to a monosyllable*, as it is now sounded, is observed." Whether it be true that the word "prayer" was ever pronounced as a dissyllable, though it may have been sung as one, we do not profess to know; but if it was, the proof Mr. Jebb adduces of its having been so was rather an unfortunate sequel to the remarks he had just made. We suppose he specifies the choral practice of Winchester, Durham, and Westminster as an exception to that of other choirs; and, accordingly, that while these three adhere to ancient rules (though the doing so oblige them to apply the rules in a new way, owing to a change in the syllabic value of the word,) the other cathedrals violate the rules by an apparent adherence to ancient practice:—that is to say, a "deference to ancient principles" in the one case led them to correct a mistake which must have occurred, had they continued the old intonation after the word had ceased to be regarded as a dissyllable; while in the other, they have respected the custom without caring about the principle,—they continue to chant the word as a dissyllable, though, in process of time, according to Mr. Jebb, it has become a monosyllable, and therefore has, as he says, another cadence "proper" to it. Now, we are very desirous of knowing in which of these two practices we are to reckon it "very possible that there may be, in fact, the assumption of some new and sound principle?" Not we imagine in the case of Winchester, Durham, and Westminster; for, by Mr. Jebb's own showing, they have assumed an *old* and *sound* principle; the "irregularity," then, in which the "sound principle" is latent, must be sought for in the other cathedrals. But their irregularity in this instance, simply consists in the use of the wrong ecclesiastical accent; and where the mysterious principle may be concealing itself is more than we can divine. To our simple apprehension, this little fact, adduced by Mr. Jebb, proves, beyond a doubt, two things:—first, that in times past there was somewhere, though not everywhere, that very deference to the ancient principles, which Mr. Jebb deprecates. The choirs of Winchester, Durham, and Westminster, happening to be acquainted with the ancient laws of ecclesiastical accent, altered the customary (for at one time it must have been the customary) manner of intoning the word "prayer," to suit a change in the syllabic value of the word; and if so, in the second place, the other choirs which adhered to the old intonation, after it had ceased to be correct, either did it in ignorance, or through perversity.* This seems to us as clear as the light of day. If the three choirs did right in making the change, the others must have

* We have recently been informed, that one of the three choirs mentioned above, namely, Westminster, still continues, in some measure, to prefer a deference to ancient principles to the chance, by setting them at defiance, of discovering new and

done wrong in not making it; or we must conclude that both were right, and so give up the old rules altogether. Had Mr. Jebb taken the latter ground, his position would have been intelligible; but as it is, we do not very well know what he would be at.

It may be a very ingenious way of viewing matters, to suppose that cathedral choirs have been for some time past, and are at present making experiments (without knowing it) on plain-tune, with the view of evolving "new and sound principles;" and, therefore, that each ought to be left to its own devices; but such a supposition sounds very like sheer nonsense. Yet, what else is the conclusion to be drawn from Mr. Jebb's discussion of the subject? He explains to us the rules of plain-tune, and speaks, with the most religious horror, of any attempt to tamper with the ancient originals of our musical service; he shows us that cathedrals have, to a great extent, practically forgotten that such rules and "ancient originals" ever existed,—admits this to be an irregularity, and yet finishes, by strenuously contending for its remaining uncorrected, because it may, by some possibility, involve an *ignotum quid* of novelty or soundness in principle.

We very much regret if we have misapprehended Mr. Jebb's meaning; but, with every wish to do him justice, we have been unable to draw any positive conclusion from that part of his work which relates to plain-song, other than this:—that we are to regard both ancient rules and ancient models as beautiful archaeological illustrations of past choral history; but which, now-a-days, are of no practical use, because the world has not only been making great progress in the arts, but we are, in fact, at the present time, engaged in evolving what possibly may turn out to be new and sound principles; and, consequently, that the question of reformation must not be mooted, since it may in the end appear that the practices, which simple people now suppose to be mere mistakes of ignorance, carelessness, or indolence, are, in fact, a sort of disguise for beauties, which are yet to be revealed to the world.

It must be admitted, that this is a most dexterous way of getting rid of difficulties. According to this view, canons, rubrics, constitutions, catholic practice, everything ancient, in short, are beautiful arrangements of old time; but they have no particular bearing on things modern; or, if they have, it is of no consequence, for we are just at this moment in the crucible, and

sound ones. One of the "uses" peculiar to Westminster, in which these new principles were supposed by Mr. Jebb to lie concealed, has altogether vanished within the last six months. It has "died and made no sign." Ancient principle stepped in, and, on a sudden, the chrysalis of the new and sound one disappeared. The fact was that one of the canons, on discovering from Mr. Dyce's work that the said "use" was neither more nor less than a mistake, lost no time in correcting it.

therefore must not be disturbed by any reference to them. By and by we shall see something turned out,—something quite new and sound. Let us wait, therefore, and allow matters to take their own course. We are all just now in the ecclesiastical nest, hatching new and sound principles; so you must give us time. Some of us are apparently sitting upon bits of stone, lumps of wood, bundles of hay: no matter; let us not be in a hurry; this apparent irregularity may, by possibility, tend to the best results in the long-run.

In this view of things, it is quite unnecessary to prove that such and such is the law of the Church,—that the “apparent irregularities” of cathedrals are real mistakes. This will be at once conceded; but the concession implies no admission that the mistakes ought to be corrected. Though real mistakes considered in one aspect, according to Mr. Jebb, they become valuable experiments in another; valuable at least in possibility, if not in fact; and, therefore, to be let alone. It is of no avail to talk of a reformation; for, in his estimate, there is no need of it; or, rather, since we have yet to make up our minds whether practices which, estimated by ancient standards, seem to be glaring defects and corruptions, are really such as they appear to unsophisticated minds.

But now it may be said that this is a matter of art, not of morals; and that we have no infallible standard to judge by in the one case as we have in the other. The arts are, or are supposed to be, always on the advance; new and sound principles of art may arise out of practices which, when referred to the usage of former times, appear to be erroneous. There may be so many “more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy,” that it is next to impossible that one age should discover and apply (or rather discover by applying) the rules of art to such an extent as to leave nothing for succeeding times to accomplish. Allowing, therefore, it may be said, that the subject of plain-tune was pretty well understood in the Middle Ages, and at the time of our Reformation, that is no reason why we should not understand it better. A long interval has, doubtless, elapsed during which the subject has been banished from our thoughts, formed no part of our studies; but still plain-song has been in use without interruption. We may have used it carelessly and ignorantly; still this very carelessness and ignorance may have tended to a further development of its beauties; and, now that we have begun again to study the practice of our forefathers, may we not take advantage of the very mistakes of the last century towards a more complete elucidation of the principles of plain-song, than the ancients were able to reach?

Again, the art of music is said, by approved modern writers, to have been in a state of great imperfection in early times and

in the middle ages; are we to proscribe improvement? Are we to deal with matters of art as with doctrines; to hold by ancient, and *possibly* Catholic, practice in art, as we do by ancient, and *undoubtedly* Catholic, belief?

This is a process of thought which evidently carries with it great force in Mr. Jebb's mind; and in truth it affords the only means of accounting for the preposterous inconsistencies to which we have been referring. Let us, therefore, look for a little while into the grounds on which the supposed force of such reasoning rests. The question is simply this:—Are the ancient melodies of the Church susceptible of improvement in the *modern sense*, or not? Were the defects attributed to them by those who advocate, what is termed, the perfect scale of modern music, the result of ignorance? Mr. Jebb affirms this: we deny it. He affirms that the ancient system of plain-song, being based on an imperfect scale, was, on that account, the result of ignorance, and therefore that it may be, and ought to be, altered and improved in accordance with modern discovery. Again, that as the invention of counterpoint brought with it the “varied and expressive resources of a more scientific music,” by which he conceives the ancient melodies may be greatly improved, we are acting “on narrow and partial reasonings,” and have a “pertinacious scrupulosity for the defects rather than the excellences of antiquity,” when we require that the Gregorian melodies, particularly the Tones for the Psalms, should be sung in unison.

Whether the ancient system of plain-song was based on the scale, or the scale arose out of the system, as a part of it, is a question by itself; but neither the one nor the other was, in the first instance, the result of ignorance. If there be evidence that the early Church musicians expressly made choice of that which is termed an imperfect system, having it in their power to employ a more perfect one, it is quite clear that we must either adopt the system as it is, or reject it altogether; since an attempt to improve it, by the addition of that which was designedly omitted, would be fatal to the very characteristics which the omission was intended to impart. Now, there is proof of the most conclusive kind to be gleaned from the fathers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, that they were perfectly aware of the existence, and acquainted with the musical character and effect of the ancient Greek scales, which (as may be proved out of Aristides Quintilian,* Ptolemy, Macrobius, Martianus Capella, Boethius, indeed all the later ancient writers on music) were not only in use among the Romans, but continued to be so after the period when the music of the Church

* Aristides Quintilian wrote his treatise in Greek, but he is believed to have lived in Rome some time after the Augustan age.

had assumed a definite character. These scales were six in number; and their use implied a perception of the beauties of melody to an extent which we not only can hardly boast of, but are unable to comprehend in the present day. One of these scales was identical with our diatonic; another was not very dissimilar to our chromatic scale. What then becomes of Mr. Jebb's bold assertion, that "the natural scale alone was then (*i.e.* in the fourth century) known?" If the fathers, who commend the gravity of the diatonic scale, and those whom they addressed had been ignorant of any other, their commendation must have been out of place; they would surely have confined themselves to simple praise of the use of music, if only one sort was known to them, or to their auditors. But, in truth, conjecture in this matter is quite unnecessary; for it so happens, that nearly every early notice we possess on the subject of Ecclesiastical music, involves a contrast between the then music of the theatre and that of the Church—the former of which was uniformly characterised by the use of chromatic and enharmonic modulations, which were strictly forbidden in chanting the divine offices.* And why was this prohibition so strict? It clearly was not through ignorance; for it is quite certain that at the time the prohibition was made, there were at the command of the Church (to use Mr. Jebb's words, in another sense) "the expressive and varied resources of a more scientific music;" and yet she refused to avail herself of the advantage. In this she, perhaps, acted on "the narrow and partial reasonings of many in the present day," when she "discouraged improvements in the arts;" we cannot help it. There is the fact staring us in the face, that the early fathers did *not* "dedicate to God's service" the "most expressive and varied resources" of the music of their time; nay, they objected most strongly to doing so. They intentionally made choice of the least expressive scale of music, then in use; and even that, in practice, they made less expressive, by excluding from it the semitones. With their eyes open, in short, they converted a complete scale into what is currently reckoned to be an incomplete one.

Whatever might be their reasons for this, Mr. Jebb, we suppose, will allow that they must have perceived some "excellency" in the kind of music produced by this imperfect scale. That which he terms the "defects of antiquity," may have been, nay, must have been, in the eyes of antiquity itself, not defects, but excellences; for the qualities of their music, pronounced by Mr. Jebb to be defects, were adopted intentionally. The rejection of the B flat, and the absence of accidental sharps, cannot have been so frightful to them as it is to Mr. Jebb; since, if they had liked, they might have thoroughly beaten us in the

* See some notes on this subject, in the *Christian Remembrancer* for 1841.

matter of sharps and B flats. They had only to borrow from the next theatre the "expressive and varied resources of a more scientific music." There they might have had quarter-tones, and thirds of tones, and semitones, and three-fourths of tones, and two-thirds of tones;—resources so varied and expressive, that modern musicians, for want of ability to sing divisions so minute, have doubted whether the ear can appreciate them. Nevertheless, they were sung in the Roman theatres; and it was precisely because they were so expressive, that the early guardians of Christian worship proscribed their use in church.

If there be any, then, among us, who, as Mr. Jebb says, have "a scrupulous regard to the defects, rather than the excellences, of antiquity," it is plain that they may turn round, and tell him that, even admitting their regard to be scrupulous, it is directed on qualities of music reckoned by antiquity itself to be excellences, not defects; and, besides, that these "supposed irregularities" of antiquity may have been, "in fact, the assumption of some new and sound principle."

But it is also possible that the regard to antiquity, in this matter, may not be so merely scrupulous and pertinacious as Mr. Jebb imagines. What if many have come to appreciate, as a matter of religious taste, the excellency of the primitive Church melodies, and to prefer them to the expressive and varied resources of modern music? What if they are able, not to conjecture merely, but to affirm that, in the intentionally limited resources and seemingly rugged character of early Church music, there *was* the assumption of a new and sound principle? What if that principle should be, that it is not perfection or imperfection of the scale, not the command of artistic resources, not mere refinements of art as art, that constitute excellence in works of Christian art, but the true and sincere expression of Christian sentiment, whatever be the means employed to effect it? What if we have come, not by "narrow and partial reasonings," but by sound philosophy, to recognise, in the character of early Church music, the unadulterated result of that revolution which Christianity brought about in the world of taste? May not a more just estimate of the use of art in divine things, have given us a new standard of excellence, which, while it sets at defiance, to a great extent, the mode of judgment which has been current for the last century and a half, leads us at the same time to appreciate the merit of early works? May we not, besides being able to prove that the defects currently attributed to the ancient melodies of the Church were intentional, be convinced that the musical effect which we feel to be so sublime in them,—so unapproachable by modern composers, is due to the very restraints imposed by the Church on early musicians? Nor need we, on this account, affirm that the early Church music is perfect, or even that it perfectly

accomplishes its purpose ; but we may be convinced that the relation between its means and its end is so intimate, that any attempt at alteration, with the view of improvement, must be on the part of those who are too obtuse to perceive the character of the works with which they are impertinent enough to meddle. For example, without affirming the treatise of Thomas à Kempis to be perfect, or its Latinity faultless,—without in the least proscribing any new attempt of the same kind, we may, with perfect justice, think that the so-called classical version of the first three books by Sebastian Castalio, is a piece of ignorant presumption. Or, to take a higher instance, it will not follow, because we may be able to show that St. Paul wrote in bad Greek, that his works, considered in their essential purpose, may be amended by emendation of his language. His language, such as it is, is perfectly adapted to the purpose he had in view, and so say we of the early music. We may dislike its purpose, or have little sympathy with its sentiment : that is a matter of taste ; but those who admire both, must not be charged with “narrow and partial reasonings,” “scrupulous regard,” and “pertinacious scrupulosity for the defects of antiquity,” when they require, that if we are to use the melodies of the ancient Church at all, we should have them as they are, not altered to suit modern theories about the imperfection of the scale in which they are composed.

In truth, it is utterly ridiculous to judge of the merit of any work of art by the extent to which the artist may have employed the resources at his command. The question is, not what means he employed, but what effect he produced ? If it were demonstrated a hundred fold more clearly than it is, that the Gregorian music is constructed on an imperfect scale, it would not follow that the music itself is imperfect, considered *æsthetically*. No musician is obliged to employ *all* the notes of the scale in *every* melody, simply because the musical effect of his composition may demand the omission of certain notes. If this were otherwise, Rossini, Bellini, all our modern composers might be charged with having used, at times, an imperfect scale ; and it would be just as absurd a proceeding to alter particular modern melodies, because it might be impossible to show from them that the composers had a complete scale at their command, as it is to insert notes in the Gregorian melodies, which, as in the other case, were designedly omitted. If certain notes never occur in the Church melodies, the reason was that the use of such notes produced a musical sentiment to which the early musicians objected. That objection, no doubt, took the form of a permanent condition of Ecclesiastical song, which, in its turn, tended to adapt the scale to the use that was made of it ; but if this adaptation rendered the scale a defective one, the deficiency was intended to secure, as much as possible, at all times, a

corresponding deficiency in the music constructed upon it; that is to say,—to secure the permanence of a certain musical character which the melodies of the Church were thought to require.

The early Ecclesiastical musicians, in short, acted as all musicians, all artists, have done and still do:—they adapted their means to their end; but they differed in this,—that whereas the latter ordinarily make rules for special cases, the former made a rule to meet all cases; having decided that Church music ought always to preserve a certain sentiment, they, in order to secure it, bound down their composers to the observance of specific limits in the use of their materials.

The Gregorian music, then, *such as it is*, ought, we conceive, simply to be received or rejected. If we do not like it, let us honestly say so; but let us not draw reasons for our dislike from mere theories which have little or nothing to do with the question of its merits as a particular species of sacred art. As a style of music it is as easily distinguishable from all others with which we are acquainted, as the Romanesque or the Pointed styles of architecture are from the Greek or Egyptian; and although, as a matter of history, we may be able to trace its derivation from one kind of music, and its gradual merging into another, just as we do in the case of architecture, its own characteristics are not the less obvious and peculiar. In this view, even were our Church silent on the point, we conceive that, in respect to present use, plain-song ought to be treated like any other species of ancient ecclesiastical art, *i.e.* to be employed or not in modern worship; but if employed at all, to be so in a pure and unadulterated form.

The readers of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER are aware that we have been the advocates of other styles of Ecclesiastical architecture than the pointed, at least, so far as to justify their adoption by modern builders; but it is one thing to allow a certain latitude in the choice of a style, and quite another to sanction an ignorant jumbling of styles. Indeed, we fancy there are not many persons in these days who would fail to conclude, that an architect who adorned a Romanesque church with ornaments belonging to the later styles of Pointed architecture, was utterly deficient in perception of the characteristic merits of either the one or the other. And the case of ancient Church music is very analogous. It has two distinct styles, each of which has belonging to it an incommunicable something—a charm peculiar to it. Gregorian melody is one of these; figured vocal music another; which of them is best, we need not undertake to decide; but one thing is perfectly certain, that, by harmonizing the former, we at once transfer it into the region of the latter; we deprive it of its identity. Good Church music may, no doubt, be produced by the adaptation of harmo-

nies to plain-song; but the plain-song, *as such*, cannot be said to be thereby improved, since it has ceased to be plain-song at all. Another species of art has been the result of this "super-addition of the resources of a more scientific music to the melodies of ancient tunes;" just as the superaddition of the pointed arch, with its more perfect science of construction, on the old Romanesque, produced not an improvement on the latter *as Romanesque*, but converted it into a new style altogether.

We say that sound principles of æsthetic criticism would lead us, if we employ Gregorian melody at all in modern service, to employ it with intelligence and discrimination, as a thing *sui generis*; and if, as has been observed, the Church had left us at liberty, we might have dealt with it as we do with any one of the species of ecclesiastical architecture, and so have considered its employment, or otherwise, a matter of choice. But the Church has not left us at liberty; she has expressed her wishes on the point. It is clearly proved, both by Mr. Jebb and Mr. Dyce, particularly by the latter, that plain-song ought to be the ordinary, as it is the only, distinctly authorized music of our service; and such being the case, we are doubly bound to use it in a pure and unaltered form.

These observations, which, we trust, will have cleared away the misapprehensions that may have been occasioned by the confused statements and inconsistencies of Mr. Jebb, will also serve to obviate an objection which (it has occurred to us, and will doubtless occur to others) may be brought against Mr. Dyce's edition of the "Plain-Song" of our Ritual, especially that part of it most likely to be referred to in ordinary cases for practical guidance. We allude to his arrangement of the Gregorian tones for the Psalms, which differs considerably from most of those published within the last few years. That it is the most accurate, if not the only true one, as adapted to our service, which has yet appeared, no one, who takes the trouble of perusing his observations on the subject, appended to the second part of the work, can have any reasonable doubt. Mr. Dyce has evidently gone into the matter deeply and carefully; and we have to thank him for much information, which we confess is as new to us as we believe it will be found to be by the majority of inquirers into the subject of which he treats.

His investigations, however, have led him to a result which, in present circumstances, is likely, as we have said, to assume the form of an objection to the common use of his arrangement of the Tones. He proves distinctly that the Gregorian chants, as they were formerly sung, and, as a reference to ancient examples shows that they ought to be sung, cannot be brought under the conditions imposed by the modern manner of uniformly dividing the chant into a certain number of bars; and hence, that the correct use of them implies the necessity of

adopting a new method of chanting. This is the difficulty ; a difficulty which we think it must have required some courage on Mr. Dyce's part to disregard. It would have been natural in such a case to have endeavoured to effect some compromise between ancient authority and modern practice ; and to have proposed an arrangement which would have applied the old melodies to the modern method of chanting in such a manner as to preserve their true character as *nearly only as was practicable*. Mr. Dyce, however, has, we think, acted wisely in avoiding this snare ; in the first place, because he has thereby preserved for his work the lofty tone of a formulary, or rule of practice ; and, secondly, because, in accordance with the views which we have advocated in the foregoing remarks, we believe that if the Gregorian tones are to be employed by us at all, they ought to be sung correctly. Our observations, indeed, furnish at once a justification of Mr. Dyce's work, and an answer to the practical objection that may be brought against it. If Gregorian music is to be looked upon as a specific kind, or style, of Church music, in the same sense as the Romanesque, or the Pointed, are reckoned styles of Church architecture, which we may use or not, but which if used, are to be used *as specific styles of art*, and of which the peculiar characteristics ought to be carefully preserved, it is evident that, on the one hand, a *jumble* of ancient and modern practice is as much to be avoided in music as it is in architecture ; and that, on the other, Mr. Dyce's correct formulary of ancient practice is the greatest boon that could have been bestowed on us.

We are persuaded, indeed, that as the study of Church music advances, people will come to look upon that which is now called Gregorian chanting, much in the same light as they regard the mongrel Gothic of Sir Christopher Wren in the towers of Westminster Abbey and elsewhere. One of the most prominent features of our age is the facility with which it appreciates the character and works of ages by-gone ; and that not in a general way, or by the cold and dispassionate estimate of antiquaries, but heartily, and as a matter of religious and poetic sentiment. We become denizens of the past, make its thoughts our own, are inspired by its feelings, with an ease, readiness, and pleasure, which is, to say the least, remarkable. One effect of this transformation is a keen perception of excellence in works of ancient Ecclesiastical art ; and having such an origin, it is easy to understand why this perception should be accompanied with the desire either *to reproduce or to employ ancient art exactly as we find it*. Our admiration of it has been gained by throwing ourselves, in imagination at least, into the circumstances, the habits, the turn of mind and sentiment in which it arose, and, having done this, our sense of its complete adaptation and fitness to its purpose, becomes so keen, that we at once detect and dislike the incon-

gruities, the unmeaningness, and the insincerity of art, such as that of Wren was, when he imitated the Pointed style of architecture without the most remote acquaintance with its spirit.

This method of learning the excellence of old art by entering heartily into its spirit, is beginning to be applied to music; and, in proportion as it is, a taste for ancient music, not in the antiquarian sense, but as the means of giving expression to a certain habit of mind and religious sentiment, must inevitably follow; and, in its turn, this will ensure the preservation of the ancient styles in all their purity. The groundwork for this result is already undoubtedly laid; and we may, without much fear of being reckoned false prophets, predict that, by and by, we shall have as great a distaste for the so-called Gregorian chants, embellished with organ accompaniments, and Mr. Jebb's accidental sharps and B flats, as we now have for Sir Christopher Wren's jumble of pointed arches with the gigantic cherubs and festoons of turnips and cabbages of the architecture of the end of the seventeenth century.

The objection, then, which for the present may be made to Mr. Dyce's version of the Gregorian Tones will not, we think, prove a very lasting one. If he has given them in a correct form, the time cannot be very far distant when the very accuracy of such a formulary will be the best guarantee for its being generally adopted. And, after all, the objection is merely a practical one, depending on habits already formed, and which, as a matter of fact, are not altogether comfortable. Indeed, there are many symptoms that, in respect to Psalmody, our habits are now actually in a state of transition. Mr. Jebb considers the manner of enunciating the Psalms in chanting to be entirely wrong in many of our Cathedrals and minor churches; and within the last few years some half-dozen publications have appeared, each of which proposes some scheme for the settlement of the question, and all of which proceed on the supposition that we are not quite perfect in this particular.

One of these publications, though not intrinsically valuable, deserves notice on one account; we mean Mr. Oakeley's Psalter with Gregorian Tones. This is, at least, an attempt at something better than we have been accustomed to; and if it has not been successful in that respect, it certainly proposes a method of arrangement so new, and so different from any of those at present in use, that if it has been possible to introduce it in practice, we need hardly despair of effecting any change in the performance of Psalmody, however radical it may be. Now Mr. Oakeley, we believe, has found no difficulty in the introduction of his method; and, although it would not require many words to show that it is inaccurate both as respects the copy of the tones used and the manner of their adaptation to the English Psalms, yet he cannot be denied the peculiar credit of

having made the first practical effort towards a restoration of the ancient mode of intonation, and of having thereby clearly evinced that the change of habit in such matters, which many people are apt to regard as a bugbear, and to consider an insurmountable obstacle, may be effected by a very gentle effort. Not that any proof of this was in reality wanting, so far at least as the mass of the people is concerned, among whom it can hardly be affirmed that any great prejudice exists with respect to Church music. A total want of interest in it, rather than prepossession in any one direction, has for a long time characterised the state of popular feeling; and although this indifference is rapidly passing away, owing to many causes, not the least being an advancement of general intelligence in the arts; still we have not got much further as yet, than a mere disposition to think well of, without being very critical on the efforts made by the Clergy toward the amelioration of this accessory of Divine service. There is evidently a desire for something better in the shape of music than our parish churches have for a long time afforded; and if we may judge by the crowded state of the metropolitan cathedral and collegiate choirs on Sundays, an improvement in the service of the minor churches would be heartily and sincerely welcomed, whatever form the improvement might assume. Certainly, when we consider the wretched condition of the service in the majority of parish churches in the metropolis, it need not be matter of surprise, if the merely uninformed instincts of the people led them to perceive that all was not as it should be. But in truth, their instincts are not altogether uninformed; the ordinary process of general education in the arts, consists in nothing more than a gradual acquaintance with works of art; and this process, as it respects music, has been going on rapidly in the metropolis for some years past, by means of street music. The character of this may generally be assumed as a test of the state of popular taste in music; and when we find ragged urchins so far advanced as to be able to sing or whistle, and therefore to admire, airs from popular Italian operas, it is not too much to say, that to ears so far cultivated, the music of parish churches on Sundays must have a sound greatly to the disadvantage of religion. The music of the streets is so superior, in its kind, to that of the parish church, that even if a comparison between them does not assume any form of recognised thought, in the minds of those who are familiar with both, acquaintance with the former must insensibly give rise to the desire of improvement in the latter, and make improvement welcome when it becomes apparent.

So far from there being, in the present habits of the people, any obstacle to amendment, we should conceive that the very reverse was true. With respect to the past, their habits are certainly as indefinite as can be desired; and their passive state

has been just so far unsettled and stirred up, by a rising taste for music, as to prepare the way for the guidance of the Church. They are sufficiently informed to desire something better than is now generally to be had, but too little so to have a definite feeling for or against any specific form of improvement that might be attempted. The obstacles, we fear, lie quite in another quarter; and sorry we are to think that obstacles and hindrances should arise, where least of all they ought to be found, namely, among those on whom, in present circumstances, the practical direction of nearly all that relates to the music of the Church devolves. It is a serious thing to make so sweeping a charge against any class of men, as to say that they are the enemies of improvement; but really, in sober truth, there is much ground for complaint, and much need of remonstrance, when we consider the offensively obtrusive manner in which our organists employ the overgrown instruments (the "music mills," as Mr. Jebb happily terms them) at their command, and not only this, but their uniform preference of music which, though confessedly not of the best sort, gives them the most ample opportunity of display, and the pertinacity with which they insist on the use of the organ in cases where not only good taste and their credit as intelligent musicians, but even common sense, ought to teach them to dispense with it.

These, it may be said, are only accidental defects; and so they are; but they have become habits—habits which involve the love of personal distinction, and therefore are of a kind which, in artists, nothing but the love of something far higher will ever be able to overcome. There is not to be found, we really believe, any more elevated and more difficult form of self-sacrifice, at the present time, than that of an organist, who, having the means of display at his command, forgets himself in the common purpose of Divine worship; and on this account, although we do not justify, on any ground whatever, the undue place which they almost universally now-a-days assume in choral performance, we are very sensible how great the difficulty of restraint on their part is.

If there be any organists who feel this difficulty, they have our warmest sympathy; but we fear there are very few, if any, who take such a view of the matter; at the least, an immense majority seem to consider it their right and their privilege to use the organ when they please and as they please—to overwhelm the voices of the choir, or to leave them to themselves, according as the fancy of the moment may strike them. If, in short, one is to judge by appearances (and in this matter there is no other way), organists of the present time are thoroughly of opinion that the use of the organ is an improvement on the want of it at all times and under all circumstances; and this, we affirm, not simply as it is a mistake, but as it is a mistake embodied in

a habit, constitutes the greatest obstacle in the way of a reformation of Church music.

There are two things to be accomplished towards such a reformation; the one, to determine what the music of the service ought to be; the other, to secure its right performance. Now, supposing it were to be agreed upon that in its best form, the music of the Church dispenses almost entirely with the use of the organ; it is easy to perceive how great a wound on the *amour propre* of organists such a determination must inflict. It is obvious that an organist who is persuaded (and what organist is not?) that the organ is the all-important element in choral performance, must consider it extremely mortifying to be told to moderate the use of his instrument, and little less than an affront to be required to silence it altogether. We say it is but natural that such men should, on the one hand, regard with dislike, and affect to treat with contempt, the views of those who go the length of wishing that our organs were entirely shut up, or, on the other hand, that they should give a preference to that kind of music which accords to the organ the most ample means of display.

We are not, however, going to enter on any general question about the music of the Church, or the advantages or disadvantages of organ accompaniment; for it will be perceived, that in accordance with the principles advanced in the foregoing observations respecting Gregorian music, the inquiry is here also a specific one. It is not whether the use of organs be in general an improvement in divine service, but whether their being used is *right or wrong in particular instances?* The question whether the organ be admissible in the *best kind* of Church music, or rather, whether that be the best kind of sacred music which dispenses with the use of the organ, is one by itself—on that we do not now enter. We take the music now performed in our churches, which, as a matter of fact, includes all sorts, from Plain-song, down to the productions of the theatrical school of Purcell and his contemporaries and successors, and inquire whether the use of the organ to all of it, indiscriminately, is not a practice on the part of organists which lays them open to a charge of gross ignorance, bad taste, or egregious vanity—ignorance, if they do not know better—bad taste or vanity, if, knowing better, they still continue to employ the organ, and give it an offensive predominance where it either ought not to be played at all, or used only for the convenience of sustaining the pitch of the voices.

This charge, as we have said, and be it carefully remarked, is not made on any general grounds respecting the use of the organ. Whether better music be produced with the organ, or without it, we need not now inquire; but it is perfectly obvious and certain, that those specific compositions by authors of cele-

brity, which are complete without accompaniment, and which were never intended to have any accompaniment, are, and must be, spoiled as works of art by such unwarranted additions as are made to them by organists. If, for example, it can be shown that Tallis wrote an organ accompaniment for his well-known service, then let us have it, by all means, performed as he intended it should be; but if the particular musical effect designed by him was to be produced by voices alone, it is neither more nor less than a piece of vulgar impertinence in an organist to overlay the composition with organ effects which Tallis never contemplated.

What would people think, or say, if the keeper of the Caroons at Hampton Court, under a notion that the colours were not bright enough, were to daub them over with fresh tints; or supposing that the pictures were deficient in light or shade, to change entirely the degree of prominence given by Raffaele to particular portions of his designs. Yet there is no difference between such a proceeding and that of organists, who assume that they know better than Tallis what effect his compositions ought to have, and what means should be employed to produce it.

Or, in the case of Rossini's operas, in portions of which the music is performed by voices alone, what would be thought of the leader of an orchestra who, in defiance of the composer's intentions, should insist upon accompanying the voices all through with trumpets, and drums, and trombones, with any orchestral effect, in short, which he might choose for the time? Would not people say he was mad, or that he was an ignorant blockhead, or a vain fool, who forgot his place? Yet this is exactly the conduct of our organists in the case of music such as that of Tallis, Bird, Farrant, and other writers of their epoch, whose compositions are purely vocal, and as such, so complete, that there is no place for accompaniment, except by a mere repetition of the notes sung by the voice; and this is altogether superfluous, if the choir be adequate to their performance.*

* That we are not exaggerating the absurd conduct of those who are reckoned the best of our organists, shall be shown by an instance. During the course of last month, Farrant's anthem, "Lord, for thy tender mercies' sake," was sung in the Sunday Evening Service at Westminster Abbey. Here was a case in point. Everybody, who knows anything of the matter, is aware, that Farrant's anthem is a purely vocal one, and, like all compositions of the kind, has vocal effects, which cannot be heard on the organ, and which the organ annihilates; as, for example, when a high note is sung by a man's voice, and a low one by the voice of a boy, the different quality of the voices produces a peculiarly beautiful effect, which the organ, having notes only of the same quality throughout, cannot imitate. Now, one would have thought the organist might have, in this instance, left the choir (a very ample one by the way) to itself. But, no; the organ began with the commencement of the anthem, rather gently. After the first musical phrase had been sung, then followed an *imitation of thunder!!!* i. e. the organist put his feet on several of the large pedal-pipe keys at once. Could anything be more preposterously out of place, more intensely dis-

In short, what we have said of Gregorian music, in respect to the addition of harmonies, we now say analogically of music by composers of the purely vocal school, in respect to the use of the organ;—if the latter, considered as a specific kind of Church art, requires the aid of the organ as an element towards its completeness, let us have the organ by all means; but if it requires no such aid,—in the name of good taste and good sense, let us not convert what is admitted to be one of the most perfect forms of sacred music into an inferior description of the music of a later age. In the music of the post-restoration school, the organ is an essential element; it is necessary to complete the intention of the composer; it would be just as preposterous to require in this case that the organ part should be omitted, as it is in the former case to insist upon its being used. As we have said, we are not disputing which kind of music is best on the whole; all we demand is, that whatever sort we agree to use shall be performed correctly and with intelligence,—not spoiled by the influence of theories about the general advantage of organ accompaniment, or the progress of musical science, which have nothing to do with the matter. If we are to have the play of Hamlet, we must neither omit the part of Hamlet, nor add characters which its author intentionally left out. And this, because of the recognised principle in the arts, that every work of genius, and the class to which it belongs, must be received or rejected with its beauties and its faults.

If we reckon the Gregorian Chants, or the music of the sixteenth century, worthy of being used in Divine service, either as classes of art, or as specimens of those classes, let them be used as such. If we are not satisfied with either, let us make better if we can; but this can only be done, as it always has been, by individual men of genius; and when we have got this new and better music, we shall not have arrived a step nearer the kind of abstract perfection which people dream of; we shall only have substituted one class of individual works for another. But there will be this difference, that modern composers will protect themselves against the unwarrantable and impertinent liberties which organists take with the works of ancient masters.

There seems to us to be a sort of *fatuity* which comes over organists of the present time, the moment they enter the organ-loft; for the very same men, in other circumstances, would admit the justice of the views just now expressed, and not only admit their justice, but act upon them. Who more strenuous oppo-

gusting to good taste, or more shocking to devout feeling? He continued the accompaniment throughout the anthem, during the first time it was sung; but left off for a little during its repetition, thereby, in fact, showing that he was aware how it ought to be performed; but we suppose his fingers were itching all the time, for, before the conclusion, we had another unmerciful crash of thunder.

nents than they to the use of accompaniment of any sort in *Madrigal singing*? If you ask them why they object to it, their answer would be precisely that which we give in the case of Church music of the age of Madrigal writing; viz. because the music requires no accompaniment, was not intended to have any; and therefore is, as *Madrigal music*, spoiled by it. Yet once set these very men on the organ-stool, let their fingers touch the keys, or their feet the pedals, and all their judgment, discrimination, and knowledge seem to vanish. We suppose the pleasure of organ-playing must be irresistible. There must be some fascination in it which gets the better of common sense and prudence. This we can easily believe. The immense size and power of an organ, the facility with which its magniloquent music is drawn out, must have an intoxicating and self-exaltatory tendency on the comparative pigmy who wields, by a slight touch, its majestic thunder. He must come to feel himself a sort of deity presiding over a world of harmonious noise. All this, we can well imagine, may happen and does happen. What then? It is nothing, after all, but a temptation, which it is the duty of organists to resist; not only as the giving way to it is a foolish vanity on their part, but as its effects are in so many cases an infringement on the prerogatives of the choir, and in every case inconsistent with the moderation which ought always to characterise the worship of God where his fear prevails.

Would the Queen of England be highly gratified by the conduct of any of her subjects, who, by way of doing her honour, should appear before her with a successful mimicry of some of her incommunicable attributes as sovereign? If they came to ask her queenly mercy and pardon for deadly offences committed against her government, dressed as kings and queens, what could she think but that they were deranged, or the most extravagantly impudent people that ever existed? Did the pagan Greeks fancy that their Jove was highly honoured by the success with which an individual once among them, produced an imitation of thunder? Did they not mark their horror of the profanity, by feigning that the person guilty of it was struck dead by a thunderbolt? Yet, if we enter our metropolitan collegiate church, the chances are, that some prayer for mercy by those who call themselves miserable offenders will be accompanied by a grotesque and preposterous imitation of thunder.

This, we hope, is an extreme case (indeed it is difficult to conceive that musical profanation can go much further); but if we may judge of the mean by the extreme, matters are in so deplorable a condition, that no language can be too strong, no means too violent, to get rid of abuses every way so detestable. We repeat our assertion, then, that the greatest obstacle to a reformation of Church music generally lies at present in the

habits of organists, and that, specially with respect to the introduction of Gregorian chanting, in its proper form, *i.e.* without accompaniment and unisonous, there is little hope of success until they are willing to consider themselves as the mere servants and helps of the choir; or, to put the matter in the form of a rule for Church music generally, until organists shall have come to regard their instrument and its music as one element only towards the completeness of choral effect, and *which is only, in fact, admissible when it constitutes, by the express provision of the composer, an essential ingredient in his work.**

Before we conclude, a few words must be said respecting another of the works cited at the head of this article: viz. Mr. Bishop's Edition of Tallis's Harmonies to the Versicles and Responses, &c.

This little work, (which, so far as its professed purpose goes, is very creditable to Mr. Bishop, and contains some new information on the authorship of certain harmonies and chants hitherto erroneously, as it appears, attributed to Tallis,) would scarcely have come within the scope of our present observations had it been nothing more than it purports to be on the title-page. But he has been trying his hand at Plain-tune for the office of the Holy Communion in a second part of the book, (to which its title makes no reference,) and on this we have a remark or two to offer.

Mr. Bishop, like many others in these days, is sensible that the music of our Church service is rather out of joint; and lends his willing hand to mend the matter if he can. He makes a beginning, accordingly, by furnishing us with a true copy of Tallis's Responses and Litany; so far well. But, proceeding onwards, he gets into deep water. He has to deal with the Communion Office, and being rather puzzled to find a something that shall look like the manual which, by the aid of Tallis, he has prepared for the Matins and Evensong, he resorts to Mr. Jebb's book for a solution of the difficulty. There he finds that the whole of the Eucharistic service must have been sung at one time; that it ought to be so now; that the work of Marbeck contains the music that was sung; but that this work being, generally speaking, obsolete, we have to hunt for new and sound principles in the present practice of Cathedrals, or, if they are not forthcoming, we may resort for guidance to books which give some account of this former practice, *i.e.* at some period

* Of course we do not mean to affirm that the organ is not to be used as a help to an inefficient choir; but we believe that most choirs are really more capable than they themselves believe, and would be more efficient if they were not always in the leading strings of the organ. All we desire, however, is, that it should be always distinctly understood when the organ is performing an integral part of the composition, and when it is acting as a mere convenience,—when it is necessary and may not be dispensed with, and when it is unnecessary and would be dispensed with if it could.

after Marbeck's work had become obsolete. The "ancient choral books," accordingly, being laid on the shelf, Mr. Bishop's chances of success rest on discovering the present or the past recorded usage of Cathedrals: and what is, what can be, the only result of his inquiry? Simply this: First, that Cathedrals have never, within the memory of man, chanted in plain-tune the office of the Holy Communion, properly so called, *i.e.* from the Offertory to the Gloria in Excelsis; and, secondly, that the only accounts we have of their former practice apply to the "second service," as it used to be termed, *i.e.* the commencement of the Communion Office as far as the Offertory—the *Missa sicca*, in short. Mr. Bishop accordingly concludes that nobody can tell how the rest ought to be chanted, and this being so, he sets to work and *invents a new use for himself*. "So little information," he says, "can be gathered as to the manner in which the office of the Holy Communion should be performed, that the editor has been compelled to draw up this portion of the work more from analogy than from positive directions. He therefore offers it simply in the spirit of suggestion, and in the hope that, should any defects be found, they will lead to the compilation of a service more perfect in its form...."

Our readers need hardly be informed, that in setting aside Marbeck's work, and with it, ancient and Catholic usage, Mr. Bishop cut himself off from the possibility of success in his attempt. The very assumption, that we know nothing of the manner in which the Communion service *ought* to be performed, is one which, of itself, no person competent to suggest the proper manner could ever have been guilty of making. And in truth, Mr. Bishop has shown that he is utterly ignorant of the subject. What, we would ask, is the analogy by which he has been guided? Where are the "positive directions," as applied to the Matins and Even-song, which he was unable to find for the intonation of the Communion-office? Is there any difference between the two, so far as rubrical directions are concerned? Not a jot. The proper manner of chanting the Communion-office is to be learned by reference to the same rules, the same directions, the same ancient exemplars, by which the true intonation of the daily office is ascertained. And if the work of Marbeck is the model in the one case, so it is in the other. That much more of the ancient music of the daily office has been in practice retained than of the Communion-service, is quite true; and the fact affords miserable evidence of the extent to which we have forgotten that the Eucharist ought to be the centre-point of interest in the ritual; but this does not alter the case. Whether we have chanted it as of old, or not, it ought to have been chanted; and had it been so without interruption, the music must now have borne traces of its Catholic origin to the same extent as that of Matins, Even-song, or the Litany does.

Considering, therefore, that the ancient intonations and music of the Communion, have been entirely disused, and, accordingly, that there is not even a shadow of the pretence on which Mr. Jebb deprecates the restoration of ancient usage, where it has only been corrupted, not laid aside, we conceive that Mr. Bishop's attempt is a most pernicious one; since it endeavours to carry the present errors and abuses of the plain-song of the Daily Service into a part of the Ritual which, hitherto, it may be said, has been devoid of music altogether. Even according to Mr. Jebb's principles, the mere disuse of the ancient plain-song does not constitute a reason for its not being still regarded as a pattern for guidance. All he contends for, is, that where the plain-song has undergone alterations in practice, we may, possibly, find that the alterations have been the result of some hitherto unrecognised principle; and, on that account, that it may be a question whether we ought to disturb present established usage. But here there was no established usage whatever. There was no vestige of a modern use, to stand in the way of the Catholic and ancient one. The ancient model on which the music of matins, even-song, and the Litany, is admitted to have been derived, provides, also, for the case of the Communion Office; but in the latter there has been no modern corruption of the plain-song; for it has never been used at all. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that, however much or little of the ancient music of the Communion Office we may care to use, that much or little ought to be taken from the Exemplar, whose authority in the matter is proved by the fact that the music of matins and even-song is derived from it.

We repeat, then, that we consider Mr. Bishop's attempt to make plain-song for the Office of the Holy Communion, not only an evidence of great ignorance—proceeding, as it does, on the assumption that we have no authority or direction to guide us in the matter,—but that the work itself is a most pernicious one, because it recommends and facilitates the introduction of un-Catholic practice, in a case where our practice was in abeyance. The sentiments with which we regard this work, are precisely those we should have, if some clerical tailor, understanding that copes, chasubles, and dalmatics, ought to be worn by the clergy, and, being unable to discover what these vestments ought to be, were to set to work, and invent a set of modern dresses, and call them by the old names. We should, no doubt, honour his zeal, and take his attempt as pleasing evidence that the decorum of the Ritual was becoming matter of general interest; but, if the dresses were neither copes, chasubles, nor dalmatics, we should, of course, object to their being used, and choose rather that the present mode should be retained, than that any change should be made in the wrong direction. If our clergy had been in the habit of wearing chasubles of the bass-

fiddle sort of shape used by the Roman-catholics, we should have felt much indebted to Mr. Pugin, or any one else, who pointed out, by a reference to antiquity, the proper form of the dress, just as we are indebted to Mr. Dyce for showing us, by the same reference to ancient principle and practice, the correct mode of intoning and chanting the service in plain-tune. But chasubles have not been worn at all; and if any one, like our tailor, thinking they ought to be, were either to tell us that it was impossible to discover what was their shape, or that such being the case, he had been compelled to invent a new dress, the answer must be, that he had as well make himself better acquainted with the subject before he meddled with it.

The plain-tune of the Communion-office is in the predicament of the chasubles: it has not been used at all; and we fear that Mr. Bishop is in the predicament of the tailor. He was unable to discover what the music of the office ought to be; and as he felt there ought to be music, he invented some, and called it plain-tune.

If any of our readers refer to the book, they may, perhaps, think that we have made too much of this mistake of Mr. Bishop; for, after all, his music is of the most innocent kind; so much so, that, like the lion's part in "*Midsummer Night's Dream*," it may be done *extempore*, for it is nothing but a monotone throughout. This, however, does not affect our argument.

A History of the Convocation of the Church of England; being an Account of the Proceedings of Anglican Ecclesiastical Councils, from the Earliest Period. By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. London: J. W. Parker. 1842.

ONCE upon a time the Great Western Railroad presented a strange spectacle to the bystanders. An engine, remarkable for symmetry, strength, and magnitude, was carrying with it an attendant train of well-filled carriages. No pains had been spared in adapting the machine to the exigencies of the journey; it was sufficiently supplied with breaks to prevent excessive rapidity, and with means of developing fresh steam in case its load should be augmented. There was space for receiving more passengers, and contrivances for adding such vehicles as might be needed for the varying districts through which it was to pass. Those who launched it from its first station had remembered, apparently, that it was not only to glide near the regal towers of Windsor, and the classic walls of Oxford, but that it was to visit the country villages of Berkshire, the manufacturers of Wootton Bassett, the idlers of Bath, and the mariners of Bristol. But now comes the wonder. At every station it was hailed, but it would stop at none, Princes and peasants, watermen and waterwomen, the manufacturer

and the trader, call to it in vain. The amazed book-keepers wave their flags, the policemen hold up their wands : but no—it passes on as reckless as Kehama of old, whose

— “brazen cars of triumph straight
At the same moment drove through every gate.”

The excellent arrangements which had been made about tickets were useless. The passengers who awaited its arrival must make their way across the country by such new roads as they could discover, grumbling at Watt, Brunel, and every body else who pretended to provide for the public accommodation. Those who entered it at all could do so only by such desperate leaps as few were quick enough to adventure. The train itself, however, went well enough, except that it laboured rather at a few ascents, as though it were in danger of stopping, and precipitated itself down the slopes with a somewhat desperate rapidity. Nor was this to be wondered at, for the spectators could see at once that there were no drivers upon the engine. Whether they had fallen off, or been forgotten, had slunk back into the carriages to sleep, or been knocked on the head at one of the bridges—the result was the same, the engine was without guidance. This circumstance, however, was unobserved by the majority of passengers, whose business was not to drive the train, but to be carried by it. Moreover, the gentlemen in the first-class carriages were too busy reading the last night's debate upon the currency to take any notice of the matter. Those in the second-class were prevented by wooden partitions from looking forwards, and they were locked up besides, for it was before the time when Sydney Smith distinguished himself as a railroad emancipator. But what seemed strange was, that an excellent carriage next to the engine was occupied by a company of engineers, who had nothing to do but to step out, and take the guidance. Yet there they sat, as still as the seven sleepers. Some thought them asleep, and many were the shouts, ay, and the missiles, directed against their vehicle. But it is understood that they were quite awake to the matter. Indeed, it is said that they were debating whether it was not much safer that the engine should be left without guidance. There were stories afloat of great dangers which had attended the attempt to direct it. If they stopped, was it certain that they could be set off again ; and were the drivers themselves quite agreed as to the rate of motion ? True, those who were waiting at the stations were likely enough to be dissatisfied : they would have to make new roads for themselves, and perhaps pull up the rail in their vexation. But those who jumped might get in as it was ; and, even if the carriages stopped, the rest might not choose to enter. And so the whole train was trusted to the instinct of the engine.

We cannot direct our readers to the number of the *Railway Times* in which this singular experiment is recorded. But, if they

are to trust to Mr. Lathbury's book, they will find an exact parallel in the condition and fortunes of the Church of England. "I will venture to assert," he concludes his work, "that no member of our Anglican Church, who fully understands her constitution, and is acquainted with her history, can deny that our position, without a Convocation, in which alone the Church can authoritatively speak, is most anomalous." How far he makes good his assertion we shall see hereafter; at present, let us observe that he first notices the earlier part of the Church's career; then shows the nature of her legislative organs; lastly, explains and deplores their inactivity.

We will deviate a little from this order, more suited, perhaps, to the describer of a railroad journey than to a systematic expositor of the Church's constitution, and profit by his inquiries into the nature and number of our Church's laws. These are mainly of two sorts, Acts of Parliament and Canons. We cannot find space to point out fully the relative places of these two classes of obligations: of which the first has always the more power, but the second often the more authority. For we cannot agree to what Mr. Lathbury says, we hope in a thoughtless mood, "the law of the land may impose a duty on the ministers of the Church, and they readily perform the duty." (P. 349.) Whether they should do so or no depends on further considerations: we ought to obey God rather than man. Were the Church, to which we have promised obedience, to give a plain command, none but an Erastian would say that we might disobey it. We hold to what was replied by Sir Thomas More to the base traitor who endeavoured to entrap him: "If an Act of Parliament was to rule that God was not God, would it be binding?" This, then, is the general position of the two authorities: where the Church speaks plainly and decisively, her Canons are of more authority with Christians than Acts of Parliament. When she does not command compliance, we are not called upon to brave the edge of the civil sword, or rather we are not justified in originating angry contentions, for what would be more desirable, but is not positively enacted. If, for instance, the State required us to alter our creeds, no persecution could justify compliance; when she interferes, as she does at present, with the exercise of our discipline—the main injury our Church suffers from the State—we are only called upon to employ peaceful remonstrances.

The most important Acts of Parliament by which the Church of England is affected are the Acts of Uniformity, passed in the 1st year of Queen Elizabeth, and the 13th of Charles II., and that of Henry VIII., by which the Clergy are prohibited from making any laws for their own guidance without the consent of the Sovereign. In each of these cases, (we say nothing of the persecuting *Præmunire* laws,) the civil power does not interfere as though possessing an originating authority, but only as watching, sanctioning, and confirming what the rulers of Christ's Church have enacted. This appears to be the theory of our Constitution, broken in upon,

perhaps, to some slight degree in modern times, but sufficiently entire to be still defensible. We hope the present generation of Churchmen will not retreat to any more assailable ground. Those who would know all the provisions (till of late years) which concern ecclesiastical matters, will find them in the learned Codex of Bishop Gibson, [the student should procure the last edition, Oxford 1761,] where those statutes, which have been superseded, are printed, by way of distinction, in a smaller character.

We find here all the State laws which affect the Church of England; and it may assist us in repelling the charge of being merely a Parliamentary Church, that many of those which are still in force are of earlier date than the Reformation. The very first clause of the Ecclesiastical Courts Bill of this year proposes to alter three Acts, still in operation, which were passed by Parliament in the reigns of the three Edwards. Nor are our Canons of less antiquity. They consist, according to the 25th Henry VIII. c. 19, of "such Canons already made as are not contrariant to the laws of this realm." Whatever portion, therefore, of the general Canon law of Europe had previously been accepted in this country, continues in force, unless it is contrary to some of our national enactments. This Act gives the same sanction to these ancient Canons, which the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer receive from the Act of Uniformity; they thus pass from the department of Ecclesiastical into that of State laws, and are not only enjoined by the Church, but imposed by the Legislature. It is otherwise with that collection of enactments which was passed by Convocation in 1602, and which was no doubt designed to form such a collected body of statutes, as should supersede the necessity of referring to the ancient rules. But, as these Canons have never received a Parliamentary sanction, they have not taken the place of the scattered fragments of original custom, and are only binding in themselves upon those who were represented in Convocation. On the Clergy, however, they have the force of law; and even beyond this they have a measure of authority. "Some of them," Mr. Lathbury says, "even now concern the laity." What should be done, *i. e.* by the Clergy, in the exercise of their functions among the laity, is indicated by this rule, and it is the duty of the ministers of the Church to induce the laity to submit to it. But no actual process against a layman can be based upon this mere authority. When Lord Melbourne, for example, two years ago, pointed to the bench of Bishops, and declared that there sat the Convocation of the Church of England, he was protected not only by privilege of Parliament, but by his lay character, from the lash of the 139th Canon, which asserts, that "whosoever shall hereafter affirm that a national synod is not the Church's Representative, shall be excommunicated, and not restored until he publicly revoke his wicked error."

It is well, however, that the Clergy should remember the punishment to which they would expose themselves by questioning the

authority of Convocation, as well as the sentence passed upon those who deny the validity of its Canons; for, strange as it may seem, "some persons have asserted that they have no authority at all. The editor of a newspaper has maintained," says Mr. Lathbury, "that they are only conventional rules among the Clergy." (P. 212.) We could ourselves mention a county paper, under Wesleyan influence, though professing great friendship to the *Establishment*, which actually maintained this paradox, at the very moment when Mr. Escott was under suspension for violating the 68th Canon. Mr. Lathbury notices, and it is needless to do more than notice, the absurdity of such discussions respecting the validity of a rule which the Ecclesiastical Courts are habitually enforcing. As well might the accuracy of the sentiment, so absurdly attributed to Lord Denman, that acts of Parliament might be safely violated, form the subject of debate among the prisoners in the Borough Compter.

But let us hear Mr. Lathbury state the constitution of that body, which claims in so authoritative a manner to be "the Church of England by representation."

"England is divided into two provinces of Canterbury and York. The Convocation of Canterbury consists of all the Bishops of the Province, who constitute the Upper House; of twenty-two Deans, fifty-three Archdeacons, twenty-four Proctors of Chapters, and forty-four for the Parochial Clergy, and one Precentor, who compose the Lower House. As there is no Dean of the Chapter of St. David's, the Precentor is summoned in his stead. Llandaff is also without a Dean, yet no one is summoned as a representative [A. D. 1842]. Before the dissolution of the monasteries, the Abbots also had seats in the Upper House, at which time it was more numerous than the Lower. At present, however, the Upper House in the Province of Canterbury consists of 22—the Lower, of 144.

"The method of choosing the proctors for the Clergy varies somewhat in different places. In the diocese of London each Archdeacon chooses two, and from the whole number the Bishop selects two to attend the Convocation. In Sarum the three Archdeacons choose six, and the six make a selection of two of their own number; and the same method is adopted in the Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry. In Bath and Wells all the incumbents choose their proctors jointly. In Lincoln the Clergy of the six archdeaconries send commissioners to Stamford, who make the necessary choice of two persons. In Norwich the two Archdeaconries of Norwich and Norfolk jointly choose one, and the Archdeaconries of Suffolk and Sudbury choose the other. The same is the case in Chichester. In ancient times the Clergy were represented in Convocation by the Archdeacons. Such is the mode of choosing proctors in the Province of Canterbury. In the province of York two proctors are returned by each Archdeaconry. Were it not so, the numbers would be too small for the transaction of business. In this Province, therefore, the proctors for the Parochial Clergy are equal in number to those for the Chapters."—P. 119.

Mr. Lathbury then notices the double summons given to Convocation, which occasioned such warm controversies a century and a half ago—controversies which called forth the genius of Atterbury, and were at length buried under the ponderous learning of Kennet and Wake. The Convocation is summoned by two writs, one from the Crown to each Bishop, which, in a clause beginning with the word "*præmunientes*," orders him to bring to Parliament his Dean,

Archdeacons, one delegate for his Chapter, and two for his Clergy, (Lathbury, p. 121;)—the other writ is from the Archbishop of each Province, who, at the order of the Crown, summons in a similar manner the Clergy under his jurisdiction. It has been a ground of contention, then, whether these writs referred to two assemblies, distinct in nature, though consisting perhaps of the same persons, and summoned at the same period, or whether they were merely adopted as a securer way of enforcing the same summons. On this important point Mr. Lathbury takes no decided view—in p. 121 he favours the former, in the following page the latter alternative. The theory of Atterbury, who adopted the last of these two hypotheses, appears to have been mainly taken up in order to assimilate the powers and processes of the Lower House of Convocation to those of a modern House of Commons; while that of White Kennet, who distinguished between the State Assembly of the Clergy and their Ecclesiastical Synod, though more probable, leaves some difficulties to resolve. These arise especially from the division of the two provinces. Freedom from arrest, for instance, is granted to delegates to Convocation in consequence of the “*præmunientes*” clause, which summons them to Westminster: by what circumstance has this been extended to the assembly which meets at York? We should gladly see some more complete and satisfactory work on the theory of Convocation, in which these questions should be fairly examined. Mr. Lathbury, though popular and useful, passes *sicco pede* over matters of research. And all his inquiries are confined to this side of the Trent. He seems to have taken more heed than King James to the difficulty of passing that river:

“Many a pennon will be torn,
And many a knight to earth be borne,
And many a sheaf of arrows spent,
Ere Scotland’s king shall pass the Trent.”

Our author is on his guard against such dangers. His mode of describing the Archbishop’s summons (p. 122) would imply, though we by no means charge him with designing to infringe the hyperborean privileges, that the southern Primate summoned both provinces. Again, in the passage we quoted, he states that “in the Province of York two proctors are returned for every Archdeaconry, therefore the proctors for the Parochial Clergy are equal in number to those for the Chapters.” (P. 119.) How can Mr. Lathbury, or his authority, Hody, be ignorant that the northern province contains twice as many archdeaconries as chapters? The delegates of the one, therefore, are three times as numerous as those of the other. Several interesting points, likewise, which arise from the divisions of the provinces, he fails to resolve. What part, for example, have the bishops of the northern province in the southern Convocation? The presence of the Bishop of Durham in a Committee of the Upper House of Convocation is mentioned by our author (p. 245) without observation. Again, if the appointment of a prolocutor arises merely from the

division of the two houses, (Lathbury, p. 124,) why do the Clergy of York appoint a similar officer, and what are his rights and duties? Yet we see from Wilkins, vol. iv. p. 567, that, A. D. 1661, the following was the course adopted:—"Post lectionem literarum commissionarium Reverendissimi Ricardo Marsh, Johanni Neill, et Antonio Elcock, directarum, et post concilii continuationem in horas pomeridianas, Johannes Neill, unus commissionarium in prolocutorem unanimi consensu electus, Archiepiscopi Commissionariis presentatus, et ab illis admissus fuit." Of these commissioners, the first was Dean of York: Neill, who was selected, was Archdeacon of Cleveland: the latter may have been chosen, lest the right of presiding might be supposed to appertain to the principal Dean of the Province. We hope that our brethren of the northern Province do not neglect to keep up their privileges, but we do not remember to have heard lately of any address presented by them to the Crown.

We are sorry that Mr. Lathbury has not entered at large upon these questions, to which his learning, industry, and opportunities qualify him to do justice. Perhaps he reserves it for a subsequent work, or a second edition. We hope he will add an Index, which, for a book like his, is particularly needed. Of his present work the historical outline of Convocation is the best part, though here too he is not altogether without error. What right has he to say that "British Bishops were present at the Council of Nice" (P. 20.)? Stillingfleet, indeed, thinks it probable; but it is not right to assert what can only be suspected. Mr. Lathbury speaks as though he had in his library the lost copy of S. Athanasius's Synodicon. Again, we are not satisfied with his notice of the 5th and 7th Councils—the 5th was not merely directed against the opinions of Origen, nor was the 7th universally received in the Western Church. He is more at home on native ground, and especially when he enters upon that interesting period of the meeting of Convocation which followed the Reformation. This was the time when the privileges of that body, as the representative of a national Church, were asserted and acted upon. To the interval between the death of Queen Mary and the Great Rebellion, all members of the Church, of course, look back as an age when her principles developed themselves with most definiteness. We next pass to the reign of Charles II., when a design was in agitation for superseding Convocation by a Royal Commission, which would have entirely altered the constitution of the Church of England, and given an opening for its total destruction at the era of the Revolution; for, had so ready an instrument been in existence, the pernicious changes which were meditated by Tillotson and his associates could hardly have been prevented, and the claim of our communion to be a branch of the primitive Church Catholic would have been altogether surrendered. It was not Courts or Prelates, but the mass of the lower Clergy, whom we are to thank, as God's instruments, at that period, for our salvation. And that they were able to defend us must be attributed in part, as Mr.

Lathbury observes, to a man whom it has been the custom of all party scribes to abuse, but who has not had sufficient justice done him by the adherents of that Church which he served with so much zeal, and for which he suffered with so much patience. The feelings of an apt representative of the Low Church party towards Peter Heylin were expressed in the assertion, [vide the interesting Life by his son-in-law, Dr. Barnard,] "that the Archbishop (Laud) might print, and the doctor (Heylin) might preach what they pleased against popery, but that he should never think them, or either of them, to be less Papists for all that." (Barnard's *Theologo-Historicus*, p. 240.) Yet Heylin, like some whom we could mention in the present day, did good service against Popery by defending the existence of that Church, which is the only barrier against its prevalence in the world. And among other services was the letter, preserved by Dr. Barnard, (p. 250,) in which he urged the summoning of Convocation in lieu of the Ecclesiastical Commission, which was endeavouring, and the warning is not without present utility, to occupy its room. The Savoy Conference followed. Then came a season during which Convocation met, but with little effect. The Revolution for a time revived its energy. The plans for improvement which were in agitation during its sessions at the commencement of the last century were many and various. The revival of Church Discipline, the regulation of the office of Rural Dean, the extension of Episcopacy on the Continent, the visitation of prisoners, the erection and endowment of new Churches, the care of our Colonies,—these were the topics to which the thoughts of the Synod were directed, and for which, had it continued to act, provision would probably have been made. That all these subjects have been handed on untouched to the present century, and almost to the present generation; that thousands, or rather millions of men have waited vainly for the beneficent ministrations of the Church, and see her pass by them year after year, as though the mute call of their brutish ignorance was no summons which could interrupt her onward course,—all this is to be attributed to nothing so directly as to the want of some legislative power in the Church, which could retard or accelerate her progress, could meet the demands of time and place, and adapt her to the exigencies of the hour.

It is not our purpose to follow our author into the disputes which at first raised a prejudice against Convocation, and led finally to the suspension of its action. But we think he has hardly done justice to the Clergy of that age; for he has not noticed what seems to us a sufficient account of the passion and prejudice with which they acted, that they were left, like the celebrated companions of Xenophon, to find their unwonted way amidst the opposition of a hostile government, and without the guidance of their natural leaders. If they escaped in safety from such dangers, it was all that could be anticipated. Disorders and disputes, and some misconduct, either among one another or towards their neighbours, were the inevitable result of so unnatural a situation. We

have in it a striking proof of the great evil which the Church suffers when men are raised to its highest offices who are without the confidence of their inferiors. Yet such was the situation of things when, as Addison expressed it, with more truth than himself discerned, the diocese of Salisbury had not a Presbyterian in it except the Bishop. We think it is Lord Mahon who has observed that this was the great thing which prevented the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline over the Clergy during the last century. And to this do we attribute the unkindly feeling between the two houses, which placed the Convocation of the Church of England in so unfavourable a light. The Crown had just commenced a merciless persecution of the Scottish Church. But the Bishops whom it had appointed here showed no sympathy with their afflicted brethren. The permanence of the Prayer Book, and the purity of the Church, was openly threatened; but no sound of remonstrance was heard from the Upper House. Meanwhile, a large body of the Clergy believed the ejected Prelates to possess the real authority of their order. How natural then their distrust of those who showed no sympathy with their dangers! How difficult was it altogether to conceal their conviction, that no army could prevail, so long as the enemy appointed their generals! And what wonder that such a state of feeling should issue in the dissensions which followed!

To all this more justice should have been done in the work before us. Yet it is gratifying to observe, that it contains the most decided protest against the Erastian notions, which would do away Convocation altogether, and that a strong desire is expressed for a revival of its action. Yet we are not sure that the author sees his way very clearly as to what Convocation *might* do, and as to what ought to be its first measures. On these points we will make a few remarks in conclusion.

The great want of the Church of England in the present day is obviously independence. She is placed in the midst of many voluntary institutions, which are constantly endeavouring to seduce her into companionship in their uncatholic ways. She pays for the negligence of her leaders during the last century, who neglected to take such steps as might have retained the bulk of the people in her communion; and she can no longer prescribe, as she once did, for the benefit of the whole land. She is contented to spread her board for such as choose to continue in her family, without taking account of those who refuse to be her children. Over their faith and habits she exercises no control. Her sons are members of a Parliament which others enter. She receives a share of national grants, which are given as well for the support of truth, as the inculcation of falsehood. She profits by a protection for her public worship, which is given equally to the Churches of God, and the synagogues of Satan. In these respects she conforms to that law of God's providence, which makes the sun to shine on the evil and the good, and gives rain to the just and the unjust.

But what she does not, and may not do, is to recognise and sanction those evils which she cannot avert. And this it is for which the sectarians clamour. It is of no profit to them to be raised to high places, so long as the King's ancient servant may sit sad and silent within the royal gates. They invite her to take livery and service with them, and offer a participation of their novel blessings. She gave degrees in her universities to those who had a Church education; they do the like for those who are educated without religion. She registered the temporal incidents of her children; they required the State, which alone of God's ordinances they acknowledged, to do so for them. She blessed marriages; they desired a mode of marriage without blessing. She educated her children; they desired the State to educate theirs. But with all these concessions they were not content, unless Churchmen might be compelled to suffer those privations which they themselves chose as their privilege. They require not only the right to grant degrees, but that our titles should not be our own exclusive possession. They compel us to enroll our births and deaths in the registers invented for their benefit. They complain because we wish to be married like our fathers, and as they did to bring up our children. All looks the same way: they have lost the benefits and associations of a Church, and wish to pull us down to their level. Their complaint is not of the situation which they have chosen for themselves, but because we cannot be compelled to share it. Liberty is not enough for them without equality. They pride themselves on being destitute of the apostolical succession. It is well. But what harm do they suffer by our retaining it? It is the old apologue—they have cut off their own tails, and would follow the fox's precedent. In other words, they want intercommunion with us. Now, there is one weak point in our system. We are compelled to recognise baptized persons, who die without being subject to sentence of excommunication, as Christian brethren. Over all such our Burial Service must be employed. The Church designed that separatists should be severed from us by public sentence, but this Parliament prevents. This, then, is our difficulty. To recognise persons as our brethren in Christ who are not in communion with any branch of the Church Catholic is a clear infraction of our principles: it imposes upon us individually the assertion of what, at the best, we think questionable: it subjects the Church at large to the heinous guilt of giving men false encouragement. A large body of the Clergy live in the constant expectation of being compelled to suffer persecution for breaking the law of the land. We speak not here of the burial of children, who have been baptized by schismatics, which may be alleged to stand upon a different footing; we take the case of grown persons, who have lived in open separation from the Church, and died declaring that they did not wish to be reconciled. What possible ground is there for receiving such persons as members of our communion? If it be a profanation to minister the Holy Eucharist to a professed infidel, why is it less so to receive

as a member of the Church's fold those who by voluntary profession are separatists? Yet the Clergyman who refuses to do so is subject by the letter of the 68th Canon to be suspended for three months. We say its letter, for the law contemplated no such case. Now what Clergyman can tell that he may not be the next who is called upon to suffer this persecution for the sake of the Gospel? But this perplexity might be removed by Convocation alone; for it rests only on the 68th Canon. That nothing else compels us to use the Funeral Service over sectarians is obvious, for had any common-law right existed, it must have been pleaded in the case of *Mastin versus Escott*. This, therefore, is the first object for Convocation—to free us from a yoke which we have taken upon our own necks, and from which nothing else can exonerate us. We need no Act of Parliament; it was our own work, and can be undone by ourselves. And why the whole body of the Clergy do not incessantly solicit the royal license for the meeting of Convocation, as some dioceses have already done, if it be merely for the removal of this capital evil, we are unable to conjecture.

We are surprised to find so little mention, on our author's part, of this, in our view most material object of the meeting of Convocation. He introduces others which, however important, are less immediately within the power of our Synod. He says, very justly, "any material change in the Liturgy is out of the question." (P. 389.) But he does not appear to discern, that there is in this case the further safeguard of a legal, as well as a moral impossibility. He is surely in error when he says (p. 124,) that Convocation can "reform the Liturgy." True, no change in the Liturgy can be made without its consent; for, having been fixed by the joint authority of Convocation and Parliament, it must be amended by the same power from which it was derived; but Convocation by itself cannot alter what the Act of Uniformity has enjoined. Were the concurrence of Parliament obtained, a change might then no doubt be effected. And this we take to be the reason why nothing of the kind is to be desired. We suppose that no party would choose to consult a body so indifferent, if not hostile, to the Church as the House of Commons. There are certainly some things which many Churchmen would not regret to see otherwise. Why should Edward's First Book have been tampered with by foreign meddlers? What evil would there be in the abjuration at Baptism, or the invocation of the Holy Ghost at the Holy Eucharist? And yet, though these things may be abstractedly good, we have no wish to introduce a spirit of innovation, which is never so injurious as in the Liturgical offices of a nation. To give the minister the option of changing a few words, (as done in America,) renders it uncertain, on any occasion, whether the voice of the Priest and the mind of the people will go together. To alter existing prayers, therefore, we should hold little short of a profanation. We think it was Coleridge who said, that, to change a word in a line of Milton was like attempting to push a single brick

out of a well-built wall with the fingers; and still less could we tolerate such a process in what is not only consecrated by the inspiration of genius, but hallowed by the associations of devotion. If any change were made, it must be of a kind which should not interfere with existing prayers, but add something alongside of them. And if we must "ventilate such generals," we should observe that the thing most wanted in our service is a sufficient variety for varying seasons, for fast and festival, for joy and humiliation. This would be attained by the permission to use one of the penitential Psalms in lieu of the 95th, or of either of the Canticles. Those who attempt to do justice to our Church's resources would thus be enabled to adapt her words more completely to every season. We will mention one thing more which we should be ready to concede to the complaint of some of our town brethren. The length of the Ministration of the Holy Communion precludes them, they say, from assuring each individual that the Saviour's body is bestowed upon him for his single benefit. This complaint is an instance of the evil of sacrificing primitive usage to present difficulties. To exclude the modern figment of Transubstantiation, the hallowed simplicity of the ancient ritual was exchanged for the short sermon to each individual, which closes our present form of administration. This is found to render the service so long, that in many places it is pronounced but once to many worshippers. The ancient words had been so chosen as not to prolong the service, being coincident in the time which they consumed with the act of administration. Thus have men created the difficulty under which they suffer. And in place of the present unauthorized omission of the words, is it impossible to return to the primitive usage; to repeat the ancient words with which our modern form commences to each worshipper, and the longer form, if need be, once only to the whole body of communicants? We counsel no deviation from the Rubric; but such a practice, as the case stands at present, would seem to us a much slighter departure from the prescribed rule than that which is now too commonly adopted.

Another advantage which Mr. Lathbury anticipates from the revival of Convocation, is the restoration of Suffragan Bishops. We know not why he supposes that any legislative act would facilitate a step which it is so manifestly in the power of our present rulers to effectuate. We are clearly of opinion that it is not advisable to seek new powers, till those which lie dormant in our system have been done justice to. Indeed, we see, from a notice of a recent tract, that he is aware that no new Act of Parliament is needed. And we heartily wish that his expectations, as to the revival of this order, may be realized. It is obvious to those who are believers in the reality of the Church's ordinances, that nothing can be more fatal than that a most important part of our system should be practically in abeyance. While the Church's office of instruction has been infinitely augmented, there has been a positive retrogression in those

parts of her system which are set forth as the especial channels of grace. Charity schools for the young have been increased; the Clergy, who were bound to preach once a month, have multiplied their homilies eightfold; but what proportionate increase has there been in the solemnity with which Confirmation is administered? The Canon which enjoins triennial Confirmations seems to measure the utmost which is aimed at, and, in many instances, not attained to by our spiritual rulers. When a Rector or Vicar is disabled by age or sickness from the exercise of his function, he is obliged to procure a substitute for the discharge of his duties. Why are the much more important duties of the successors of the Apostles to be in such a case neglected? We have heard discussions of late respecting the establishment of new Bishoprics. This would no doubt be desirable, but the project is beset with such difficulties as must delay, if not defeat it. For our part, we agree with Mr. Lathbury, that the best remedy is to use, in the mean time, our existing powers. Let the Bishops, who are oppressed by extensive dioceses, or whom age or sickness disqualify from exertion, procure the aid of Suffragans. By this means the functions of the highest office in the Church would be duly performed. We should not hear of churches being opened by license, because the Bishop could not attend to consecrate. How interesting and impressive is it, that the place of God's especial presence should, from the period of its first tenancy by mankind, be taken possession of by the Church's solemn rite, secluding it from aught else till the hour of doom! How grievous is it that this affecting privilege should be sacrificed to the convenience of him whose office it is to be the servant of all men for Christ's sake! Yet how can it be otherwise, while the Bishop is oppressed with his present load of business? He can but do his best. But let him have an assistant, empowered to execute such portions of his office as are committed to him by letters patent, and restricted, under penalty, from doing more, and the whole of any Bishop's duties might easily be effected. We will venture to say, that the effect produced upon the whole Church would be instantaneous and incalculable. The Hierarchy would begin again to be not merely a system of polity, but an instrument of grace. The people would learn that the Church is not Episcopal in name alone, the priesthood would give effect to the words of the Apostolic martyr, and do nothing without their Bishop.

Now, although the session of Convocation is not needed to give effect to a law which is already in existence, yet we agree with Mr. Lathbury in supposing that nothing would so certainly lead to the consecration of Suffragan Bishops as its assemblage. To enter upon the reasons of this opinion would lead us into somewhat delicate ground. Suffice it to say, that the only reason why Episcopal duties have been so grievously neglected, as in some cases might be instanced, has been because there was no authorized means of applying a remedy. That a clergyman should reside for years on the continent, and shut up

his church, is impossible—he has a superior who would prevent it. Is the same thing impossible for a Bishop? The answer is but too apparent—what has been done may be repeated. But it is clear that such a thing could not be done were there any authorized assembly of the Church's representatives, which was convened to redress such abuses. And so on in respect to lesser evils. The grand abuse of the present day, the great inattention, namely, to the due efficiency of Confirmation, is a case in point. Considering that our present want is Church Discipline, that it is only to be approximated to by such processes as may at least enable the Church to declare who are and who are not her members, the cardinal point of our system would be such a provision as pointed out distinctly how men entered into full communion, and enabled us to keep a precise register of our members. This would at once make the Church an organized body. If Confirmation was never ministered save when young people were prepared and fit to approach the Lord's Table, and if the Church's order to require the names of new communicants were obeyed, this object would at once be secured. But the great hindrance which is felt by the parochial clergy is, that the rare recurrence of Confirmations makes it dangerous to reject unfit parties, lest they should be altogether lost sight of before the return of the three years, when the Bishop is compelled by canon to administer this rite. What result might follow its more attentive celebration may be illustrated from the following passage of a work, which contains some useful observations in the midst of much which is low and fallacious:—

“Another cause of the great influence of the clergy, and of the total absence of religious dissent, is the great consideration in which the rite of Confirmation is held. It is not here, as it practically is in the Church of England, a mere ceremony, in which the Bishop knows nothing personally of the parties he is admitting into the Church, and the parish priest knows little more than that they were baptized, and are of age. There is here a strict examination by the Bishop, or the Probst, or rural Dean, into the young persons knowledge of his moral and religious duties, his capacity, acquirements, and character; and it is only after a long previous preparation by his parish minister, equal almost to a course of education, the confirmants being instructed singly, as well as in classes, that the individual is presented for this examination. I was present lately at a Confirmation of about twenty young persons in our parish church by the Probst. The examination, in presence of the congregation, occupied nearly two hours. It was a sifting trial, to know if each individual attached the real meaning to the words he was using, and actually could understand what he had been taught on the subject of religion. It was evident that considerable pains had been taken with the instruction of each individual. To pass such a confirmation implies that the young person is well grounded in the principle of his moral and religious duties, and is of good character and understanding. It is, in common life, equivalent to taking a degree in the learned professions, being, in fact, a certificate of capacity for discharging ordinary duties and trusts. It is accordingly so considered in Norway. “A *confirmed* shop-boy wants a place,”—“Wanted a *confirmed* girl who can cook,”—are the ordinary advertisements to or from that class of the community; and the not being confirmed would be equivalent to the not having a character, either from want of conduct, or of ordinary capacity. Something similar prevailed formerly in Scotland, but not to the same extent. A young man of the labouring class usually took a certificate of his good character from the minister, when he

removed to a distant parish. The confirmation in Norway certifies much more, as, in the face of the congregation the confirment has shown that he can read, and has the use of his mental faculties to an ordinary degree, according to his station, and has moral and religious principles to direct him. It is extraordinary that the Church of England has not, like this Lutheran sister in the north, kept fast hold of a rite, which connected her so closely with society, its education, and its business. This simple discharge of an unexceptionable duty shuts out dissent from the Norwegian Church."—*Laing's Residence in Norway*, p. 188.

We will close with but one further observation—respecting the probability that we shall live to see Convocation restored. We often hear its want deplored, and the fault laid upon her Majesty's Administration. Now this is surely most unfair. The fault is obviously with the Clergy themselves. Why should they expect to see this Synod restored, till they express their wish for its restoration? The Crown has solemnly promised, and the promise is repeated in every copy of the Book of Common Prayer, that whenever the Clergy petition for a restoration of their synodical functions, no opposition shall be offered by the secular power. (*Vide* Proclamation prefixed to the Articles.) The State requires only to be told when Convocation is thought needful. Every time it summons a lay-parliament it calls our assembly together, and waits only for a request from the Clergy to give it freedom of action. Now, is such request made? From how many Dioceses has it yet come? We have heard of it in two or three, but what is done by the rest? But, it is said, if the request were made it would be fruitless. So long as the Royal Declaration continues to be appended to the Book of Common Prayer, we have no right to suppose that its promise would be violated. Should such be the case, the Church would, no doubt, be exonerated from its responsibility: but till we ask we cannot allege that we have been denied. As yet the fault is our own.

It is the more needful to say something on this subject, because the duty of petitioning has been so long neglected by the Clergy, that they need as much to be reminded of the manner, as of the necessity of its performance. At the present moment, for instance, we have the form of a petition before us, which is said to be "lying for signature" at the very shop whence Mr. Lathbury's works issue. [Parker's, West Strand.] Yet we think it impossible that the author of this singular document can have read even so slight a sketch of the nature of our Synod as Mr. Lathbury supplies. We say nothing of the structure of the petition, less perspicuous and scholarlike than we should have desired: our objections are to the admission, that we are without a legislature, and that the Houses of Parliament have the power of supplying one.

Neither of these assertions is true. We have a Legislature, though its powers are in abeyance. We cannot allow that "Convocation has fallen into desuetude." If any Clergyman thinks so, let him formally deny the 139th Canon, and see whether the Ecclesiastical Courts would not teach him that the sacred Synod of this nation,

which still meets at least once in seven years, is the Church of England by representation. Convocation has no more ceased to exist than the House of Commons in the interval between a dissolution and re-election.

This may seem to some a verbal question, but its vast importance is the conclusion which its denial involves. What leads men to petition the Houses of Parliament but the notion that Convocation has ceased to exist, and that it remains for our civil rulers to establish a new system of Church legislation? Now, that they have any power to do so we altogether deny. The attempt would imply that the Church of England was an Act of Parliament Church; which all her advocates have perpetually contradicted. Yet what else were she, if the Houses of Parliament could do more than give their temporal assent to her spiritual enactments? It would be for the Church herself to consider of "the establishment of some deliberative Ecclesiastical body, having authority to frame regulations, and to decide in questions of doubt and difficulty." And she has already considered the point sufficiently. Parliament can only lend the sanction of its powers to what is already settled by authority.

We hope, therefore, that no Clergyman will sign this objectionable petition. Indeed, we doubt whether any one can sign it without danger. Let it "lie" to the end without signatures.

But do we wish the Clergy to do nothing? On the contrary, we rejoice that attention is called to the subject; and entreat them to petition the Queen that our existing Legislature may have scope for action. Let her be requested to call together, without delay, her Ecclesiastical Council. Let every Diocese send up its separate petition; and if the other estates must be included, let us ask the Lords, the Queen's hereditary advisers, to join in our request. In truth, however, this seems idle, till we have ourselves asked. Till the Clergy of every Diocese have petitioned the Queen for redress, how unmeaning is it to have recourse to secondary quarters! If we languish, for want of the power of adapting our resources to the time, let us not look to others to remedy the defect. It is not the laity, whose duty it is to look for guidance; it is not the country gentlemen, who are busy with their secular cares; it is we ourselves, who sit still and neglect to do our part. Who then but ourselves are the culpable individuals? The mighty machinery of our Church system is mismanaged or forgotten; thousands are ready to profit by its divine march; they wait only that we should give them the opportunity, and open for them a course. That this is not done, is no fault of statesmen or parliaments; it is not the crime of economists or politicians; it is the Clergy's fault, and, till they attempt to alter it, will undoubtedly be their sin.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Report of the Oxford Parish Burial Ground Committee.

THE value of this document is not to be rated by its length. It is the record of a most energetic and successful maintenance of principle in the face of an apparently irresistible opposition; and it has opened a question of general and vital importance to the Church. We will first give a history of the events connected with this matter, as far as we have been able to ascertain them, because they afford a striking illustration of the manner in which an evil precedent is allowed to establish itself, unless it happens to be encountered in its infancy by men of more courage and long-sightedness than common. At Oxford there is an admitted want of space in the burial-grounds attached to several of the churches. The defect ought to be remedied; and the natural and obvious course would have been to consult the leading residents of the place as to what the remedy should be. And foremost among persons so consulted, of course, should have been the Clergy. But instead of pursuing this method, a few busy individuals resolve that they will have a Public Cemetery, in which the ancient practice of interment shall be entirely departed from, and one of modern date substituted in its stead. Had such an intention been openly avowed, the citizens would have scouted it; or had the real movers appeared in the matter, it would at once have failed. But upon the plea of health, a number of benevolent, unsuspecting, and unsuspected individuals are induced to place themselves at the head; and the very name of a Cemetery throws them upon the precedent of Kensal Green, &c., and the last Act of Parliament. A meeting is called, by special invitation, of persons supposed to be friendly, and resolutions are prepared beforehand, and all things seem to promise the overthrowing of the system of more than a thousand years in the ancient city of Oxford, by a kind of *coup de main*. But there happen in Oxford to be a body of Clergy a little better informed than in some other places; and though only asked to attend at the eleventh hour, they had yet the perspicacity to see through the nature of the proposal, and the moral courage to oppose it in the midst of a large and influential meeting already committed to its adoption. Nine Clergy withdrew, no one following them; and small comfort we may well conceive they were likely to meet with from the Heads of Houses, who, as a body, seem to have a righteous abhorrence of anything like principle. By degrees, however, a few persons came over to their side; and this gave opportunity for the more cautious, whose sympathies no doubt were all along with them, had not prudence stood in the way, to declare themselves. And now we see that they number supporters from all sides and parties.

But it is not our object to do honour to these men, who have nobly stood in the gap; but to assert a great principle, and to bring before our readers, and the Church generally, especially its rulers, before it be too late, the general question of Public Cemeteries.

It appears that the first Act of Parliament authorizing the establish-

ment of a Cemetery was passed in the year 1823. Whether this was designed for those who used and those who refused the Church's burial equally, we have not been able to ascertain; but there are said now to exist at Liverpool, for which place the Act was passed, distinct Cemeteries for members of the Church and Dissenters. About twenty Acts have subsequently been obtained, in all of which a single plot of ground is divided in two parts, a wall or a trench forming the boundary. Yet it was not the spirit of Schism that gave rise to these joint Cemeteries, so much as the spirit of Mammon. They were, in their origin, and still are, almost exclusively, private trading speculations, in which the only object proposed is to secure as many burials, and, consequently, as large returns as possible. The Dissenter, or the Jew, or the Mahometan, who brings his money in his hand, is just as acceptable a customer as the most orthodox Churchman. But the question appears now to be assuming something of a more public character. Mr. Chadwick, the Secretary of the Poor Law Commission, who seems to have a special antipathy to all the ancient institutions of our land, has written a voluminous report upon, or rather against, intramural interment, as injurious to the public health; and recommending the appointment of a central Board of Health, with a staff of officers, in every considerable town, whose duty it should be to enter every house which had been invaded by death, inquire into the causes of decease, carry off the corpse, possess the exclusive furnishing of coffins, and ultimately convey the body to the Cemetery, which is to be at some distant spot,—three or four serving for the whole of England. Of this Report we do not like to suffer ourselves to speak. Its offensiveness is only relieved by the extreme impudence and absurdity which characterise it, and the utter ignorance displayed of the feelings of Englishmen. It is amusing, indeed, to find a gentleman at Somerset House quoting Jeremy Taylor and the Fathers; intended as a *ruse* to catch unfledged Churchmen, *we* accept it as a homage to the increased value now set upon ecclesiastical lore; and only wonder that the author had not more wit than, in one of the very pages in which he makes this extraordinary display, to speak of a Government Cemetery in contrast with a church-yard, as “an object on which the mind may dwell with complacency, a place in which sepulture may be made an honour and a privilege!” as though the shadow of a church and the remains of ancestors for many generations mouldering around into the common dust, was not an object to be regarded with complacency; and as though the blessing of the Church was not a greater “privilege” than the warrant of the Board of Health, and her Majesty's Secretary of State!

But we will not waste words on Mr. Chadwick. Our objections lie against public or joint Cemeteries generally, and they are shortly these:—1. Individual Churchmen, by cooperating in their establishment, and Bishops, by consenting to exercise their sacred office in their behalf, are helping to embody and give a visible, permanent, corporate existence to Dissent. The burial of the dead is one of the duties of the Christian Church; and she cannot, without dereliction of principle, recognise any body of men acting in that

matter independently of herself. Still less ought she to bring herself within sight of those who transgress her laws, and to encourage them, by uniting them together, and so giving them a kind of symbol of unity. Moreover, (2,) if the only external difference between those who depart with the Church's blessing, and those who are separated from her, is allowed to be the merely lying on the right or the left of some path, or trench, or dwarf-wall, in one common Cemetery, are we not in great danger of casting a stumbling-block in the way of ill-informed persons, and leading them to make light of the distinctions between right and wrong? 3. Another, and a very strong objection to these Cemeteries, to our mind, is this, that they amount to the legal establishment of Dissent. Every such Act of Parliament recognises Dissent, and helps to establish it. Can this be done without sin, both individually to those who concur in the scheme, and nationally? 4. In all Cemetery Acts with which we are acquainted, the Company is invested with the power of making by-laws respecting the use of the Cemetery, and the duties of the officers connected with it, by which the right of Incumbents, and even Bishops, are virtually set aside, —a power which might be made an engine for harassing the Clergy in a most vexatious way, and which, by its very existence, is an insult to the whole Clerical body. Lastly. They render the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, in regard to burial, altogether hopeless.

But what, it may be asked, is to be done? Parliament, it is probable, will not sanction your exclusive burial-grounds, and what then? Our answer is, and we are indebted to the Oxford Committee for it; no one had before made the discovery, —Do not go to Parliament at all: but go, instead, to the Office of the Commissioners for building Churches, in Great George-street, Westminster, and they will be able to give you all necessary powers and facilities. One of the express objects of their incorporation in 1819, was to facilitate the "purchase of Cemeteries *not within the bounds of the parish*, for which the same shall be provided;" and if it is wished to unite together burial-grounds for several parishes, the Act will furnish the necessary powers; and the ground, when consecrated, follows in all respects the rule of the old church-yards. For this purpose the Act authorizes the sale of lands under every kind of holding, whether held in trust, by corporations, or colleges, or any other bodies whatever; and if even additional facilities were required for promoting this great sanatory object in the way most congenial to the feelings of Churchmen, they could not consistently be refused by the Legislature. We trust that the Church in many places will see the wisdom of taking the initiative in the matter, now that attention has been drawn to the subject, and will meet the demands of the political economist by providing for the burial of the dead in the great towns,* with a due regard to the public health, and without the sacrifice of those great essential principles which the Church Universal has ever cherished. We again repeat our thanks to the Oxford Committee, and especially to the nine Clergy.

* The Rector of Bath has munificently given a plot of ground for the benefit of that city, which has been recently consecrated by the Bishop of Salisbury.

Since the above was written, we have received a "Statement of the attempt now making in Oxford to obtain additional Burial-ground, without doing violence to the Parochial principle," (Parker, Oxford,) which persons who desire further information on this subject will do well to purchase. It is written in that healthy and beautiful spirit, which seems to make all the sons of Oxford one family. Though the subject seems eminently unpromising, it is treated with almost touching propriety.

1. *Appeal to the Members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, &c. Second Edition.* By WILLIAM SCOTT, M.A. *Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Hoxton.* London: Burns, &c.
2. *Observations on an "Appeal to the Members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," in a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Russell.* By RICHARD BURGESS, B. D. &c. London: Seeley, &c.

THE "Appeal," which we noticed in our last number, has reached a second and considerably-enlarged edition: it now bears the author's name—a piece of formal information which recent circumstances have rendered necessary, although we believe that it was generally known from the first.

Mr. Burgess' publication we were rather curious to see. At the last meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, this gentleman, in an offensive personal attack on the Author of the "Appeal," thought proper to give out that he was prepared to prove that all the passages produced in the "Appeal" were shamefully garbled, and that it was utterly unworthy of credit. What could Mr. Scott and his friends anticipate from this bold flight? Of course an elaborate proof that Robert Nelson had not been mutilated, that Bishop Wilson had never been falsified, that Ken was intact;—we expected a mass of documentary evidence to demonstrate that the S. P. C. K. reprints agreed *verbum pro verbo* with the accredited editions of the old divines. This would have been a conclusive answer to the "Appeal."

But what is the result? Does Mr. Burgess make good his vaunt? From p. 1 to p. 31, there is not one single syllable in defence of the S. P. C. K. reprints: *they are abandoned without a murmur!* the accuracy of Mr. Scott's collations and contrasts is not disputed in a single instance. Again: Mr. Scott undertook to prove that No. 619 was inconsistent with the theology of the best English Divines, such as Hammond and Bull; with the recognised principles of the founders of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Nelson, and Grabe, and Melmoth; and with the teaching of the most eminent Bishops of the present day. How does Mr. Burgess answer this? By quietly observing, in an anti-climax almost ludicrous, that—

"If I had a little time at my disposal, I should not fear to undertake to prove that the doctrine set forth in Tract No. 619 is in perfect harmony with our Articles, &c. and with our soundest divines of modern times; but the observations I have

taken the liberty to place before you, sir, are CONFINED TO SHOW that, whether the doctrine in the Tract No. 619 BE AT VARIANCE WITH THE AVOWED PRINCIPLES OF THE SOCIETY or not, the author of the 'Appeal' has" [done what?] "*misrepresented the doctrine in the tract, and that there is no judging from his extracts, and from the conclusion he draws, what the doctrine of justification, according to Bishop Sumner's view, is.*"—P. 30.

and, at the same time, by asserting that he (Mr. Burgess) admires No. 619, that he (Mr. Burgess) is a much better theologian than the author of the "Appeal;" that the author of the "Appeal" is very young, and has no right to have an opinion about No. 619, or to express it, &c. &c. which may be all very pretty platform talk, but is most sorry logic. Indeed, we have come to the very bathos of controversy, when, because Mr. Scott seems to be of the old English school of Bishop Bull, he is quietly told that *therefore* he knows nothing of divinity, and is coolly referred (p. 19) to Grotius and Whitby! A Dutch Protestant, though one never to be mentioned without respect, and an Arian are to teach us the Anglican doctrine of justification, and we are to burn Hammond and Bull, as well as Newman and Knox!

Indeed, we are not much surprised at Mr. Burgess's reluctance to grapple with the question of Anglican divinity; he is much more at home among Swiss than English Protestants. Mr. Burgess, we find, has the singular honour (see the Report for 1840) of being, with Mr. Hartley, of Nice, the only English clergyman who figures as *Membre honoraire et externe du Comité de la Société Évangélique de GENEVE*. This Society is under the control and management of the somewhat notorious Merle d'Aubigné. It is on the Bible-Society plan, *and something more*. Hear Mr. Vice-President Merle d'Aubigné's *Rapport de l'Ecole de Théologie*:

"Où, appelés avec d'autres frères, que nous avons la joie de voir en partie au milieu de nous—nous donnons la main à toutes les églises Protestantes nationales qui sont demeurées dans la vérité—à nos frères Calvin, Farel, Luther, Zwingli, Cranmer, Latimer, Knox; mais ce n'est pas trouver en eux des hommes, *des formes, une hiérarchie*;—nous donnons la main à l'ancienne église Catholique—mais ce n'est pas pour avoir *une succession humaine, une consécration valable, une mission assurée*, (Dieu nous la donne et non les hommes!)—Et s'il est des gens qui s'attachent avant tout à tel ou tel gouvernement d'église—nous nous hâtons de la rejeter. Ne voyez-vous pas que ce que ces hommes imprudens appellent *église*, et veulent nous imposer comme puissance première, est *une épaisse vapeur, sortie des lieux bas de la terre*," &c. &c.—P. 35.

This is but the Bishop of Chester's "Satanic doctrine" in another form; but if this be the view of unity held by "Rev. Burgess à Chelsea," is not he the very man to teach us who are "our soundest divines?" We only remember one parallel to this absurdity,—Dr. Chalmers lecturing on the Church of England!

But, says Mr. Burgess, the "Appeal" has assumed importance because it has been adopted by the Lichfield memorialists (see our Intelligence department, p. 516). "True," seems to argue Dr. Russell's correspondent, "the 'Appeal' consists of two distinct parts; one a criticism of No. 619, and one an examination of the reprints of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge: true also that the Lichfield memorialists do not say one word about No. 619, and I do

not intend to say one word about anything else : true that the Lichfield memorialists only refer to the 'Appeal' on the allegation of altering the old Divines, and this is a subject on which I cannot say a single word ; but then, somehow, if I can get up a prejudice against the 'Appeal,' as far as relates to No. 619, perhaps the Lichfield memorialists, and the thick-headed rustics who compose the Society, will be good enough to consider this as tantamount to having replied to the 'Appeal' on the mutilation question." In other words, if I can prove that A is not B, I flatter myself that I have demonstrated that A is not C. Mr. Burgess has not, we believe, had the benefit of academical training; a ten-year man, however, who quotes Epiphanius, might have heard of the *ignoratio elenchi*.

The sum and substance of Mr. Burgess's pamphlet is a coarse and ungentelemanly tissue of the most vulgar and silly personal abuse of Mr. Scott, who, through one-and-thirty pages, is sneered at for being young, and, therefore, unfit to protest against tract No. 619, while at p. 30, Mr. Burgess, meaning we suppose some hidden piece of humour, which few will be skilful enough to discover, affects to doubt whether Mr. Scott wrote the pamphlet at all! or "whether such a person exists"! The absurdity of such "observations" requires no exposure.

We now await the promised report of the standing committee on the mutilation question; and in the meantime we commit to our readers' attention Mr. Scott's re-statement of his case, which we extract from a manly and straightforward, and at the same time very conciliatory, advertisement, which he has prefixed to his second edition:—

"1st. That the charge against the *present governing body* of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge confines itself mostly to the publication of Tract 619, and I argue that the tone of theology in this tract, thus adopted by the Tract Committee, is the last and most important proof of the ascendancy of principles foreign to those of the founders of the Society; and, therefore, that the publication of Tract 619 is 'a doctrinal change lately introduced into the series of tracts circulated under their authority.'

"2d. That the charge of corrupting or of suppressing the text of deceased authors applies not so primarily to the present governing body; but so far to them, because having had their attention called to it, they have not repaired this wrong. It does not apply, nor was it meant to apply, to them as having wilfully corrupted the text of deceased authors; but it applies to the whole Society, because the corruptions and changes exist as a fact, whensoever or by whomsoever introduced. So that even admitting that it may be proved that these changes have been gradual, and that some of the mutilations are of long standing, it will be quite useless to produce old copies of the Society's own reprints, of Bishop Wilson, for example, as authorities for the present state of the text. There may be precedent for it, and yet the corruptions may and do exist. The charge is, that the Society's reprints are corrupt: it is no answer to this to say, as was said some years ago in the case of one of Wilson's Family Prayers, that an edition sixty years old had the passage in the words complained of. Do the Society's reprints agree or disagree with the authorized, genuine, accredited editions of the old divines? This is the only question to be answered; and it is quite beside it to say, 'We did not change the text.' It may turn out that the practice of mutilating commenced early in the Society's career. Be it so: our business, now such practice is known, is, not so much to fix the blame as to undo the injustice and to retrieve our character. And when we refer to Nelson and Wilson, we do not quote them as infallible, nor do we say that their language might not be improved: the theology of the eighteenth century falls very far below the best standard; what we now complain of is, that, low as it is, we are sinking even lower. The changes are not only bad, *as changes*, which is our point, but as for the worse, which is another."—*Advertisement*, pp. iv—vi.

Thus, then, stands the case at the present moment. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge are charged with having abandoned the principles of their founders, by adopting No. 619 ;—"Granted," says Mr. Burgess, "but I like No. 619; and the author of the 'Appeal' don't understand it." This seems a dispute between the Rector of Upper Chelsea and the Incumbent of Hoxton, with which the members of the S. P. C. K. have marvellously small concern: let the respective polemics, if they please, wrangle it out till they are wearied. But the author of the "Appeal" also charges the S. P. C. K. with having corrupted Ken's Manual, Ken's Directions for Prayer, Ken's Hymns, Melmoth's Great Importance, Wilson's Family Prayers, and his Short and Plain Instruction, Robert Nelson's Christian Sacrifice; and with having abandoned a whole host of orthodox books, commencing with Kettlewell and ending with the Shadow of the Cross. With this allegation, which was that alone adopted by the Lichfield memorialists, the members of the Society are very seriously concerned; and to this not an attempt at a reply has been as yet ventured. What the Standing Committee will answer, it would be improper to surmise. Mr. Scott properly reminds us—

"Are our reprints trustworthy, or not? It is a very subordinate matter to find out *who* corrupted them. Even if it could be shown that we never had a genuine reprint, yet, *is it right that the tracts should continue unfaithful?*"—*Advertisement*, p. x.

We have spoken, it may be, sharply of Mr. Burgess; but we ask the educated gentlemen of England who may have come in contact with him, either at the Board of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, or elsewhere, whether any remarks or discussions of his ought to receive more respect than may be due to their intrinsic merit, or relevancy; and whether when, as in the present case, they happen to be quite beside the mark, they are content to allow him to be cited as the champion of the Church's principal Society, almost in one sense her *Home Office*? That Mr. Burgess is only a half-educated man might have been his misfortune, not his fault; and had his career been one of modest usefulness, we should not, even in the heat of controversy, have thought it fair to twit him with the fault. But he has all along been an obtrusive person, with neither learning nor depth to justify the position which he assumes, and he himself forces on us the necessity of making people feel this if we can.

An Explanation of the Position of the Twenty-first Canon of the Scottish Episcopal Church. By the Rev. A. EWING, Presbyterian of that Church, and Incumbent of St. John's, Forres. A. Brown & Co., Aberdeen; R. Grant & Son, Edinburgh; J. Burns, London; and J. H. Parker, Oxford.

THE cause of innovation in the Scotch Church has found an extremely feeble defender in Mr. Ewing. The Scotch Liturgy must be safe, if it cannot be assailed by stronger arguments than these; *e.g.* :—

"Both Offices are good; either sufficient; but that is the better which represents all, which supports the weak, and prevents our good being evil spoken of. Both Offices are clean in themselves, doubtless; but if one be rejected by weak brethren, and by them be esteemed to be unclean, to them it is unclean; and so long as we insist on its use by them, we put a 'stumbling-block and occasion to fall in our brother's way.' If we urge that he is weak, it aggravates the offence, because his helplessness ought the more to move our compassion. In the Church of Christ there must be babes in Christ, and in those services where they meet the strong they must be contemplated with great forbearance."—P. 6.

That individuals should exercise a caution and forbearance in the expression of their opinions, we grant; but that a Church should give up truth in order to please its own "babes," is an absurd and untenable position. The "babes" ought not to dictate to their spiritual mother. Mr. Ewing's notion of the claims of "babes in Christ" is an extraordinary one.

Again:—

"Let none suppose, however, that such a step as the abrogation of the Scottish Office is recommended with a view to render England the test of Catholicity, or the centre of Catholicity, or with any desire to worship England at all. God knows we owe little unto England. England is the reverse of Catholicity in her treatment of her own Colonial Clergy, in her treatment of other sister churches, in her secular and quasi Erastian habits. Were it not for the faithful men in her orders we have among us, looking unto late events, I would say, 'Who is he that wishes more men from England?' But, because we have adopted the rest of her Liturgy,—because all of us can find the expression of our sentiments in her Communion Office, because in other respects we are as one Church and nation, let us not rend the unity of the Reformed Catholic Church of Great Britain by having diverse administrations of the one Bread in the one Body. The object of all Liturgies is uniformity of worship. If we break that uniformity in such an important point as the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, we defeat the object of all liturgical service."—Pp. 8, 9.

Mr. Ewing must know that if the Scotch Communion Service is exchanged for the English one, that exchange will tell so far on the side of the English Church, to the depreciation of the Scotch. Mr. Ewing, also, must know that "the unity of the Reformed Church of Great Britain" is *not* "rent" by having different Communion Services. It is not rent as a matter of fact; and there is no reason in the world why it should be by such a circumstance. The object of a liturgy, says Mr. Ewing, "is uniformity of worship:" yes, in the Church which uses it. Those who meet together for prayer in the same Church, should use the same order of prayer; but this is quite another thing from that order of prayer being bound to be the same in all Churches.

Margaret, or the Pearl. By the Rev. C. B. TAYLER, M.A.
London: Longmans. 1844.

It would be a waste of criticism to bestow much of it on this piece of ignorance and folly; which, indeed, is too weak and mawkish to give any satisfaction, except to those who are weak and mawkish themselves. But even such, if possessing any access to the facts, may, perhaps, be capable of asking, and then answering, the following questions, whether—leaving out of the question individual follies,

the direction and extent of which are, of course, beyond calculation,—the class of clergy whom Mr. Tayler calls *Tractarian*, on coming into a parish “dismiss all the Sunday-school teachers, dispense with the services of district visitors,” “expressly forbid the laity” to “read the Scriptures, or give instruction of any kind in the cottages of the poor;” and while they celebrate daily prayers in their churches, “recommend” “the people to discontinue the practice of family worship.” Supposing an admirer of Mr. Tayler’s, if such there be, were to pay a visit to Leeds, and ask whether these things were so, we can fancy the uplifted eye-brows of the numbers who have, within the last few years, been taught and encouraged to practise the duties of Christian laymen, as they never had been before; and how their patience might, perhaps, fail them, were the traveller to ask further, whether their pastor “seldom visited them in their own houses.” The force of falsehood, as of folly, can no further go, than by giving such a description, meant to be generic, of a class to which Dr. Hook, Archdeacon Manning, Mr. Perceval, and the Wilberforces, with many others, of whom it is to be read by contraries, belong; and all of whom are *Tractarians*, in the judgment of the very silly author of this book.

As usual with tales of this kind, we are in very high company, surrounded by rank and elegances; and the titles and names of the places—Glenarden, Duneden, &c.—would make us fancy ourselves in Scotland, though, of course, the scene is laid among ourselves. This may seem a small matter, but it indicates a want of sense in the writer.

Ecclesiastical Law. The Constitutions of Otho, with Notes. By JOHN WILLIAM WHITE, Esq. of Doctors' Commons, Proctor. London: Rivingtons. 1844.

THIS work was originally published in the *British Magazine*, while under the conduct of Mr. Rose. To have received his approbation and *imprimatur*, is a sufficient guarantee of its excellence. There is no branch of learning in which our Clergy are so miserably deficient as Canon Law; and, as has been well observed, we want text-books. Gibson’s Codex is indispensable, but too long; Johnson’s Vade Mecum too short, and unsystematic; and Burn’s Ecclesiastical Law is too restricted in plan. We want more familiarity with the Common Law of Christendom. Lyndwood much requires a new edition.

From the “Summary of the Legantine Constitutions made in the Pan-Anglican Council, held at London, in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, A.D. 1236, and in the 20th of the reign of King Henry the Third, the Lord Otho, Legate of Pope Gregory the Ninth, being president thereof, assisted by St. Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, Walter, Archbishop of York, and by other English Bishops,”—for various reasons, which will commend themselves to the most obtuse,—some of information, and some of amusement—we venture upon an extract or two.

II.—ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.

“The sacraments of the church are to be performed gratis and readily, purely and devoutly; wherefore those who wish to enter into holy orders, or have the cure of

souls, shall be particularly interrogated as to how many and what such sacraments are; and archdeacons shall take care that those within their archdeaconries who have been already ordained, be properly instructed in the administration or performance thereof.

Note.—[11. This constitution is now in great measure altered, for by a constitution of Archbishop Langton, which had reference to all the sacraments, it appears that it had then become customary for offerings to be made by those to whom the sacraments were administered, and that such offerings might even be demanded as a matter of right. Langton's constitution is quoted in *Burn's Ecclesiastical Law*, tit. 'Baptism,' in the words following—'We do firmly enjoin, that no sacrament of the Church shall be denied to any one, upon the account of any sum of money; because if anything hath been accustomed to be given by the pious devotion of the faithful, we will that justice be done thereupon to the churches by the ordinary of the place afterwards.' For the constitution itself, see *Lindwood*, ed. Oxon., p. 278. And indeed it is highly proper that it should be so, and is in accordance with scriptural authority—'If we have sown unto you spiritual things,' &c. And by the Rubric, in the office of matrimony, at the time of delivering the ring, the man shall also then lay down the accustomed duty to the priest and clerk; which, however, if he refuse to do, whether the minister is bound to proceed nevertheless does not appear from any rubric or canon." See *Burn*, tit. 'Marriage.')

What will they say at Leeds to the following?

"XII.—NO BENEFICE TO BE DIVIDED INTO PARTS.

"Never, at any future time, shall one church be divided into several rectories or vicarages. And such as have been already thus divided, as soon as it can be conveniently effected, shall be restored whole again, save only such as shall have been so divided a very long time since, and these shall be divided over again into more suitable and convenient portions by the diocesan, who shall provide that in each of the divisions, one, having the accustomed cure of souls, shall reside. Furthermore, concerning the residence of rectors at their churches, and the holding a plurality of benefices, we think it more advisable to refer to the constitutions of the Roman pontiffs, than to frame new ones.

"*Note.*—[XII. There are several causes or reasons in the law for this consolidation, incorporation, annexation, or union of churches; and they are chiefly these five:—1. An unlawful dividing of those churches or ecclesiastical benefices, precedent to their re-integration or intended consolidation, as when such as had been formerly united were illegally divided. 2. For the better hospitality, and that the rector might thereby be the better enabled to relieve the poor. 3. The overrichness of the churches each to the other in point of situation, inasmuch that one rector may commodiously discharge the cure of both, by reason of the vicinity of the places. 4. For or by reason of a want or defect of parishioners, as when one of the churches is deprived of her people by some incursion of an enemy, or by some mortal disease, or sickness, or the like. 5. For and by reason of the extreme poverty of one of the parishes.—*Godolphin*, c. 14, s. 3, where are copious particulars on this subject.]

"The Epistles of Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Epistle to Diognetus," have been published in a portable little 12mo., by "Algernon Grenfell, M.A., one of the Masters of Rugby School," (Whittaker,) who has prefixed a judicious preface, and interspersed the text with a note or two, here and there. Mr. Grenfell deserves the thanks of divinity students for presenting them in so accessible a form, with a body of documents with which they cannot well dispense.

"The Church and its Ministers," &c., by H. Stebbing, D.D. (Taylor and Walton,) is an inquiry into the early condition of the Church,—a subject which might have been thought exhausted, but on which Dr. Stebbing seems to us to have said a good deal that was well worth the saying.

"The life of St. Stephen Harding, Founder of the Cistercian Order," (Toovey,) is the first of the long-promised Lives of the English Saints. Into the difficulties which have hindered, and in some degree obviated, the execution of the plan of this series we have no care to enter. A more delightful book in the way of history, and a more interesting one in the way of information, we have not often met with. Indeed, Mr. Newman, writing with his whole heart in the

matter, and in some instances, as we fancy, perhaps unconsciously, picturing his own trials in those of his subject, and in the corruptions of the Church of the twelfth century, reading us a significant lesson in the nineteenth, could not but produce a work of surpassing power. It has all the beauty of a romance, and the mastery over style which Mr. Newman has now attained, renders it in this respect perhaps the most remarkable of his works. A very grave and all-important question is, however, suggested rather than answered by this publication. We should be unworthy of our office were we not to bear the fullest witness to the needs of a self-denying life: did the biography of St. Stephen Harding answer no other purpose than testify to the fact that there have been those who through grace have given up all for Christ's sake—who have lived a life of Faith and of the Cross, very different things from preaching about them, it would be a great gift to the Church, in *all* its branches degenerate. We want such testimonies in this luxurious and voluptuous age. But we question when men are to be led back to the ascetic life—and such is our greatest practical deficiency—whether some will not be deterred from commencing even any discipline by the exhibition, *in the first instance*, of the rigorous Cistercian rule. Some, again, will be led to conclude from the absence of certain qualifying phrases that the austere and celibate life is recommended as the only possible assurance of the Gospel's strait and narrow path: we miss, here and there, —what would have been very consoling and true, too,—some such distinctions as those of 1 Cor. vii. "Pulse and water" may be blessed as the prophet's diet, but may we conclude a rule from this mystical instance? The austere life is rather of the evangelical counsels than of direct and universal command: and there can be no question that in it certain facts of our human nature itself, God's gift, are sought to be obliterated rather than corrected. Can the argument of Butler's three first sermons, for example, be made to hold with the impression which the unwary might derive from St. Stephen Harding's life? We speak of it not as the legitimate, but as the probable inference from Mr. Newman's delightful, and, we will add, most subduing, volume. While we are on the subject, though by a most violent transition, we cannot award the slightest praise to the fittingness *in this place* of Mr. Pugin's frontispiece: correct and beautiful it is, and an admirable reproduction, both in feeling and detail, of a mediæval subject. But the stern abbot of Cîteaux, he of the morass and the forest, with his rough cloak and scanty fare, his horror of splendour and beauty even in architecture and ceremonial, to be seated in a cloister as lovely as that of Salisbury, attached to an abbey of the most glorious proportions, surrounded with cushioned faldstools and jewelled mitres, brazen lecterns and richly-bound missals, diapered pavements, quatrefoils, clasps and illuminations, is as inharmonious as would be the Gregorian tones with a grand piano forte accompaniment: Scene, a drawing room: Performers, two young ladies.

Next in importance, or perhaps prior to Mr. Newman's book, is "Dr. Pusey's Guide for Passing Lent Holily," translated from the French of Avrillon and adapted to the use of the English Church. (Burns.) A most practical book, and one most acceptable to what we trust is a growing body,—those who seek to realize the severer life. It is enriched with a simple and intelligible introduction from Dr. Pusey, which will serve to dispel unreal thoughts, and mere talk about personal religion. The dedication is a dutiful and encouraging sign of Dr. Pusey's very considerate and loving nature. To the use of foreign devotional books, such as these, we have not only not the slightest objection, but we are very thankful for them. Thomas à Kempis, St. Francis of Sales, Pascal, Quesnel, and Nicole, are recognized English books, and we are glad to see the list extended: but we are by no means reconciled to this "adapting to the use of the English Church:" it is but the old story of Ken's Manual over again in another form: "acceptable" is not the English of "*méritoire*," and we are not so certain that the latter word, literally rendered, is not patient of a Catholic sense. It is an unfair practice which we are sorry to see strengthened by Dr. Pusey.

Following up the same subject, it is quite consoling to find so many, and in many respects differing minds all turned one way, and that the way of penitence. Mr. Perceval's Two plain Sermons on Fasting, (Leslie,) may well be classed with the two last works. And all these warnings will serve to show us the danger of permitting the present *taste* for monastic institutions to degenerate into mere feeling and sentiment. A full choir and splendid church, long processions, cross and chasuble, banner and staff, these may be with, but most certainly also *without*, the life of Him crucified.

The "School-master's Manual of Bible Instruction (Burns) is a valuable addition to school-books, and its "Glossary of Ecclesiastical Terms" is a happy thought.

We were quite affected with Bishop Doane's *American* reprint of "Bishop Selwyn's Letters to the Society for Propagating the Gospel." The excellent Diocesan of New Jersey has prefixed a characteristic and, therefore, warm-hearted preface.

Dr. Moberley's Five Sermons, "The Sayings of the Great Forty Days between the Resurrection and Ascension," (Rivington,) is one of the most important books of the season, both as regards the subject—the Church, God's new Theocracy—and the richness and learning with which it is treated.

A specimen of a projected "Catechism of the History of the Holy Catholic Church, from its rise to the close of the eighteenth century" (Burns, and Rivington,) has reached us. It is executed with care and distinctness, and we wish every success to the undertaking; but in a plan so important we think the catechetical form proposed anything but happy. Such a book will be studied, not learned by heart: and question and answer for eighteen centuries is both bald and tedious.

The "Prophetic Register," edited by R. W. Vanderkiste, (Masters,) we denounce unconditionally. It is a catch-penny of the vilest description; by its most offensive placards about the walls of London, we find the Weekly Dispatch and Dissertations on the Millennium in grotesque and hideous combination. The publication itself is a collection of the wildest and most exciting dissertations, from all sorts of heretical and schismatical sources, on the awful subject of unfulfilled prophecy, flung together at random: the editor's principle of selection being apparently that of the prudent Tiresias:

"O Laertiade, quicquid dicam, aut erit—aut non:
Divinare enim magnus mihi donat Apollo."

"Almsgiving, ancient and modern," (Simms, Bath,) an excellent because brief and pointed warning on the benefits of the Offertory.

A "Letter to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster on the intended alterations in the interior of Westminster Abbey," (Rivingtons,) gives rise to the most painful reflections. *Because* attendance at Divine Service in this noble Church is daily on the increase, *therefore* the building is destined to be spoilt by the rash and conceited ignorance of the utilitarianism of the day. We freely acquit the Dean and Chapter of intentional wrong: but they are under the very worst of professional guidance, if under any. Can it be believed that it is not only seriously proposed, *but the plan is all but begun*, to throw the transepts into the choir for the mere sake of increased accommodation, by removing the present side screens, leaving the ugly stalls and organ screen as they are at present, and the nave empty? It is to go for nothing with the Dean and Chapter that there is not a precedent for this most offensive scheme in a single Cathedral in Christendom,—it is to go for nothing that a square box will thus be constructed for an audience, and not for worshippers, two thirds of them shut out from altar, alike, and from the sound of the lessons and prayers, *and from all but the pulpit*. The letter-writer proposes, and very properly, to throw open the nave by removing the present organ, which, it has been ascertained, formerly stood in the west aisle of the north transept, that the stalls—alas! a reduced number

for a plundered foundation—should be removed further eastward, and that the whole space of the nave from the cross to the great western door should be fitted with open seats. This is a noble plan, combining the advantages of thrice the accommodation of the transept scheme, without violating ecclesiastical precedent, to say nothing of the majestic effect which it would produce. We are speaking strongly, because we feel strongly; but we do trust that the most pointed remonstrances will be urged against the scheme of the Dean and Chapter. No time is to be lost: the Vandals are all but at their spoils. The spirit of Will. Dowsing is evoked. Let the architectural societies protest, let Churchmen protest: a principle is about to be sacrificed—ancient custom to modern presumptuous ignorance. The Dean and Chapter have a very grave responsibility laid upon them: already the interior of Westminster Abbey is a disgrace to any caputular body: the laity profanely admitted within the sacrum, and the finest mosaic in England before the altar all but irreparably ruined thereby—a noble font built into a dark cupboard—dirt, destruction, and ruin in every part; and now to consummate all, they intend to make the (in its way) finest church in Europe, in the largest city in the world, a laughing-stock to every antiquary, and a disgrace to every Churchman. Puritan and rebel have hitherto inflicted no permanent injury in the way of *principle* on an abbey of six centuries of splendour and propriety:—this distinguished honour is reserved for the taste and literature of our own refined days.

There is no end to wonders! We lately remarked on the extraordinary extent to which Theology, in one form or other, was prevailing among all classes; and lo! as an illustration of our remarks, here comes "The Primitive Church in its Episcopacy," published by no other than Mr. Colburn. This book is by the author of "Dr. Hookwell," and a well-principled, intelligent book it is, calculated to give much information to the class by which it is most likely to be read. We do not accuse the author of what annoys us,—it is but a new manifestation of the publisher's besetting sin; but we beg the favour, if he have the power, to stop or abate a great nuisance in future—we mean the egregious *puffing* of *Dr. Hookwell* in the fly-leaves of the present book. *Dr. Hookwell* was a well-meant book, containing some excellent things; but as a novel it was an utter failure; the choice of the hero was felt to be a most unjustifiable use of a contemporary good man's merits and services; there was no creative power shown either in the story or the characters; and to talk of it as having produced a sensation, to speak of it as having been seriously ascribed to such a man as Mr. Milnes, to describe it as on the table of every undergraduate, is only to cover it with ridicule—a ridicule which might extend to the far more useful work, in juxtaposition with which we find such a farrago of nonsense.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge are publishing a pretty series of little square fourpenny illustrated books, called "The Meadow," "The Corn-field," "The Hedgebank," "The Wood," "The Heath," "The Sea-shore," &c. This is safe ground; mistakes here will do no harm,—no "Appeal" need be apprehended.

To "Amy Herbert," a Tale, in two small volumes, published by Longmans, we cannot award better praise than to say, that it paints nature to the life. It is by "a Lady," for whose soundness Mr. Sewell is sponsor. It is admirably adapted for the young of the higher classes. We hope that it may not be the author's last production. Only let us hint to the author that there is the *appearance* of a little want of reverence in the use of the Lord's name. And we never can be other than dissatisfied with the practice of *advertising*, as editor, other parties, and those, in all cases, of more reputation than the author. Far are we from seeking to impugn the character of such as Mr. Sewell: but can he be ignorant where this practice of "*editing*" commenced? Another instance, where the most mischievous confusion has followed this practice, is that of a recent novel, "*edited*" by Mr. Plumer Ward.

The "Committee of General Literature and Education" (S. P. C. K.) have published No. I. of a new series of "Reading Lessons." The subjects of the

Lessons, we are glad to be able to report, are more appropriate than in the "First Book" published under the same auspices, and the general tone more pure and healthy. At the same time, the book appears to us to have been prepared with but little skill. The lessons do not increase in difficulty; so that a child which can read the first can read the last,—we speak of Part II. Again, in Part I., although mention is made of the short and the long sounds of the vowels,—the "First Book" did not even distinguish vowels and consonants,—there is no attempt at showing what the causes are which lengthen them.

There is, it appears, at Bath a most energetic "District Visiting Society," which not only makes soup for the poor, and employs interesting young ladies to carry about baby-linen, but also publishes an Almanack, now in its fifth year,—and truly a curiosity this Almanack is. It professes to "contain twice the usual quantity of matter; and is designed to unite entertainment with instruction." And amongst its most "entertaining" peculiarities is the manner with which it deals with the festivals of the Church. It neither omits them all, nor recognises all; and what the principle of selection is we have endeavoured in vain to discover. At first we thought that those only which concern our Lord's own Person were inserted; but this would not do; for the Circumcision is given, and the Presentation is omitted. Neither, again, are the apostles impartially dealt with,—St. Paul and St. Bartholomew being honoured with observance, St. Peter and St. Matthew being cast out. The Blessed Virgin fares no better, the Annunciation being recorded, the Purification premitted; nor even the popular marks of time, the feast of St. Thomas being duly noted, but no mention made either of St. John Baptist or of "Barnaby bright!" The substitutions which are sometimes made to the places of the ejected Saints are no less remarkable: thus, Sir Walter Scott is canonized in the stead of St. Matthew; John Wesley supersedes St. Chad; and Oliver Cromwell has ousted the Evangelist St. Mark! St. David, Archbishop, gives place to the pithy apophthegm, "never trouble others for what you can do yourself." In the greater number of instances, the place of the deprived Saint is left unoccupied. In sober earnest, would it not be better for the learned Society above-mentioned to confine itself to "Advice about Savings' Banks," and "How to get sixpennyworth of good for a penny," and such like legitimate suggestions; and to consider, for the future, that the Church has already definitely fixed her own Calendar?

Mr. Gresley's "Anglo-Catholicism" will scarcely need a word from us, in order to secure extensive circulation. It was written with the view of calming unreasonable apprehensions, which are said to be abroad, by a distinct avowal of attachment to the English Church; and those who are acquainted with Mr. Gresley's honesty of purpose, and the remarkable perspicuity of his style and cheerfulness of tone, will know that he possesses peculiar qualifications for effecting this object. We rejoice to be able to add, that he has not, in so doing, departed in the smallest degree from the principles which he before advocated; nor, after the example of certain parties, to whom we alluded last month, on account of some trifling difference of opinion, is he prepared to throw himself into the arms of those, to whom, in nine points out of ten, he has throughout his life been diametrically opposed. Indeed, he does not scruple to read these "neutral" (qu.?) gentlemen a good lecture, and shows that "moderation" does not consist in finding a *via media* between high principle and low practice, but in thoroughly mastering the Church's theory, which is itself a *via media*, and in keeping to it. The cuckoo cry of innovation he rightly meets, not by a negative, but by distinctly admitting that change and reformation are the objects proposed by the body of men whom the worldling and the Evangelical, the Infidel and the Puritan conspire to calumniate—"change and renovation in a *corrupted system*—to raise the poor from the depths of degradation, to save the rich from their debasing self-indulgence, and to infuse the spirit of Christianity into our every-day duties and feelings."

We feel called upon to protest most earnestly against the device and motto

assumed by the "Clerical Club," of which the prospectus has been forwarded to us. The idea of a Clerical Club in itself, associated as such things are with idleness, and luxury, and gossip, and absence from home, is, we confess, not much to our taste; as indeed associations of this kind were forbidden by the early Canons of the Church. But to apply the Apostle's words, "Quis separabit?" (Romans viii. 35) and to set up, by way of emblem, a figure clinging to a cross, is really a profanation of the most holy things, which no clergyman ought to tolerate. Did the inventor of this device know the words that follow his motto in the Sacred Scriptures? Or how dare he speak of these panders to luxury in an effeminate age, in connexion with "tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or the sword?" Nothing surely but infatuation could have led persons so to blazon forth their own condemnation!

The translation of the "Chronicles of Jocelin of Brakelond," under the euphonious and presumptuous title of "Monastic and Social Life in the Twelfth Century," by Mr. S. E. Tomlins, for Whittaker's "*Popular Library of Modern Authors*" (!) appears to have been made in a spirit for which we have the smallest possible sympathy. The translator belongs to that miserable cold-hearted school of antiquarians which has prevailed in this country for many years,—men who have no more feeling for the objects of their inquiry, than the student in anatomy for the corpse on which he is making experiments. Now, if to reverence the aged be a scriptural duty, we are at a loss to understand why the obligation should not increase rather than decrease with the lapse of time; and we are not afraid to avow our opinion, that the absence of this reverential religious feeling is what has marred the success of so many of our professed antiquaries. It is undeniable that the majority of recent English antiquaries have been of this cold unsympathizing temperament, (as e. g. Mr. Fosbrooke, the author of "*British Monachism*," and Mr. Wright, the impersonation of all guinea-subscriber-antiquarian-societies,) and how stunted their growth, need not be told. A catholic spirit seems pre-eminently needed in inquiries into the past; and wherever success may have been gained without it, as in the case of some of the sceptics of Germany or France, we believe that it is assignable to a deep sentiment of enthusiasm almost akin to religion. In this "Chronicle" we have the annals of the Abbey of Bury St. Edmund's during about thirty years, which, under a better interpreter than Mr. Tomlins, would serve to show the beneficial temporal uses which resulted from religious houses in the days of old,—uses which, though they might vary in kind, would doubtless still be derived from their existence. The world is still as great an enemy to God as ever: the oppression of a cotton-lord is not less grinding than that of a feudal knight; there are rustics who still need education and the offices of religion to be pressed upon them; the effectual fervent prayers of righteous men have not yet lost the promise. But for these objects Mr. Tomlins has no eye. The failings of individuals are made to extend, *of course*, to the condemnation of the whole, and their very virtues do the same, for they prove, what?—that they "were in advance of the age in which they lived." So argues Mr. Tomlins of Islington!

The world, at least the sermon-writing section of it, will not profit by our frequent warnings. The evil of single discourses "printed at the request" of Churchwardens and sundry Tomkinsons, old and young, male and female, is rather on the increase, we fear: all our protests go for nothing. So to prevent anything like jealousy among the type-loving clergy we intend to label this last article of our review with Martial's motto:

"Sunt bona, sunt quædam mediocria, sunt mala plura,"

without relegating to each class the single specimens. If the authors choose to prefer the former and their readers the latter, "there may be much to be said on both sides." With which sage judgment we acknowledge Mr. Pelham Maitland's "Baptismal Regeneration," Mr. Griffiths' "God's presence in the Church," preached at Astbury, Mr. Wilkins' "*Club Sermon*," preached at Wiveliscombe.

MISCELLANEOUS.

[The Editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed in this department.]

REVIVAL OF CONVENTUAL INSTITUTIONS.—No. III.*

(Testimonies continued.)

"THE preamble of the very Act that annihilated the lesser monasteries, after suggesting the propriety of suppressing all such houses as had been certified of less value than 200*l.* per annum, and giving them, with their lands and revenues, to the king, proceeded 'to distribute their members amongst the great and honourable monasteries of the realm, where, thanks be to God, religion is well kept and preserved;' and granted to the king power to found anew such houses as he should think fit, by virtue of which, fifteen monasteries and sixteen nunneries were actually refounded, and remained until swept away again in the general destruction. Latimer, it is well known, never hesitated to express his sorrow at the wholesale ruin of those buildings, but, with honest earnestness (says Southey, 'Book of the Church,' p. 71, vol. ii.) entreated, that two or three in every shire might be continued, not in monkery, he said, but as establishments for learned men, and such as would go about preaching and giving religious instruction to the people, and for the sake of hospitality."—*Lord J. Manners.*

"It was not the strict and regular lives of these devout ladies, nor anything that might be said in behalf of the monasteries, that could prevent their ruin, then approaching, so great an aim had the king to make himself thereby glorious, and many others no less hopes to be enriched in a considerable manner. But to the end that such a change should not overwhelm those that might be active therein, in regard the people had everywhere no small esteem of those houses, for their devout and daily exercises in prayer, alms-deeds, hospitality, and the like, whereby not only the souls of their deceased ancestors had much benefit, as was then thought, but themselves, the poor, as also strangers and pilgrims, constant advantage, there wanted not the most subtil contrivances, &c. . . . And as for the fruit which the people reapt after all their hopes built upon those specious pretences which I have instanced, it was very little; nor is it a little observable that, whilst the monasteries stood, there was no Act for the relief of the poor, so amply did those houses give succour to them that were in want."—*Dugdale.*

"To preserve some remembrance of these structures, once the glory of our English nation, and of their founders, that so highly deserved of the several ages they lived in, is the design of this book. No; I am not ignorant that the

* When will controversialists learn the simple lesson, that the only legitimate weapon of Christian controversy is brotherly remonstrance in a spirit of sorrow, love, and prayer! It is painful to find one, who has had such opportunities as Mr. Maitland of acquiring this lesson from his intercourse with the saintly spirits of elder times, so far forgetful of their precept and example, as, in the Preface to his valuable papers on the Middle Ages, to have assailed the proposed revival of conventual life in a modified form, with the unchristian arms of ridicule and satire. As far as regards the influence of Mr. Maitland's strictures, the advocates of the revival may be much at their ease. It is not a few clever popular arguments set off by "disdainful sharpness of wit," that can countervail a deep and solemn persuasion originating simultaneously in many independent minds, and founded on the keen perception of a want which (on the evidence of so many competent witnesses) nothing but institutions of a conventual nature, let them be called by what name they may, can supply.

Mr. Maitland has done so much good service to the Church, and is likely to do so much more, that the only feeling his opponents on the present question would wish to cherish is one of regret, that he should have indulged his peculiar vein on a subject, the seriousness of which ought to have exempted it from ridicule, and that he should have engaged himself on a side where his chief sympathisers will be persons with whom he neither has nor would wish to have (on questions of Church order and discipline, that is) any other sympathies.

generality of people, ever since the dissolution, have, through a mistaken zeal and false prejudices, thought that the very memory of those great men, who erected these places, ought to be buried in the rubbish of those structures that they designed should perpetuate their names to eternity. . . . Nay, so much are some people possessed against them, that the least mention is odious and ungrateful. But there are no grounds for it; seeing *these religious places were, by the well-intended charity of their founders and benefactors, built, endowed, and adorned (how much soever they were afterwards abused) to the glory of God, the service of religion, and the relief of poor Christians.*"—*Idem.*

"There are some, I hear, who take it ill that I have mentioned monasteries and their founders. I am sorry to hear it; but (not to give them any just offence) let them be angry if they will. Perhaps they would have it forgotten that our ancestors were, and we are, Christians, since there were never more certain indications and glorious monuments of christian piety and devotion to God than those."—*Camden—Pref. to 'Britannia.'*

"They well deserved their popularity. Wherever monasteries were founded, marshes were drained, or woods cleared, and wastes brought into cultivation. The humblest, as well as the highest pursuits, were followed in these great and most beneficial establishments."—*Southey—Book of the Church, vol. i. p. 61.*

"Therefore Cranmer advised the dissolution of the monasteries, as a measure indispensable to the stability of the Reformation; and that out of their revenues more bishoprics should be founded, so that, dioceses being reduced into less compass, every bishop might be able to fulfil the duties of his office. And to every cathedral he would have annexed a college of students in divinity, and clergymen, from whom the diocese should be supplied. *More than this might justly have been desired.* After a certain number of monasteries had been thus disposed of, *others should have been preserved for those purposes of real and undeniable utility connected with their original institution;* some, as establishments for single women, which public opinion had sanctified, and which the progress of society was rendering, in every generation, more and more needful; others, as seats of learning and of religious retirement. Reformed convents, in which the members were bound by no vow and burthened with no superstitious observances, would have been a blessing to the country."—*Idem.*

"Jamdudum diem fatalem obierunt monasteria nostra; nec præter semirutos parietes, et deploranda rudera, supersunt nobis avitæ pietatis indicia. Minus impendiosa hodie cordi est religio, et vetus dictum obtinet, '*Religentem esse oportet religiosum nefas.*' Videmus nos, heu videmus, augustissima templa et stupenda æterno dicata Deo monumenta (quibus nihil hodie spoliatus) sub specioso eruendæ superstitionis obtentu, sordidissimo conspurcari vituperio, extremamque manere interiectionem. Ad altaria Christi stabulati equi, martyrum effossæ reliquię. Sunt quidem zelatores adeo religiose delirantes, ut religiosos veterum ordines *ἐκ τοῦ φέρτος τῆς ἀβυσσοῦ* prognatos aiant. Ita licenter sibi indulget *προσπάθεια*. Neque deerunt hæc, quæ vivimus, ætate homunciones, elephantina olficientes promuscidæ, qui ista, quæ jam prodeunt, tanquam futilia, inutilia, et hodiernæ rerum conditioni minime congruentia damnabunt."—*Sir John Masham's Προσῳδαὶ to the Monasticon.*

"He (Archbishop Leighton) also thought the great and fatal error of the Reformation was, that more of those houses, and of that course of life, free from the entanglements of vows and other mixtures, was not preserved, so that the Protestant Churches had neither places of education, nor retreat for men of mortified temper."—*Bp. Burnet's Memoirs of His own Times, vol. i. p. 39.*

"He reckoned the greater number of the regular clergy in Roman Catholic countries to be little better than *ignavi fures*—rapacious drones; at the same time that he recognised among them a few specimens of extraordinary growth in religion, and thought he had discovered in the piety of some conventual recluses a peculiar and celestial flavour which could hardly be met with elsewhere. Of their sublime devotion he often spoke with an admiration approaching to rapture; and much he wished that the sons of a purer faith and discipline could match them in that seraphic strength and swiftness of wing by which

they soared to the topmost branches of divine contemplation, to crop the choicest clusters of heavenly fruitage. . . . Would Christians retreat occasionally from the dizzy whirl of life, and give themselves time to reflect, they might become enamoured of those beauties which lie above the compass of natural vision, on the summit of God's holy mountain."—*Idem*.

"They were tolerable tutors for the education of youth, there being a great penury of other grammar schools in that age; and every convent had one or more therein, who, generally gratis, taught the children thereabouts. . . . Grammar was here taught, and music, which in some sort sung her own dirge (as to the general use thereof) at the dissolution of abbeyes. Nunneries also were good she schools, wherein the girls and maids of the neighbourhood were taught to read and work; and sometimes a little Latin was taught them therein. Yea, give me leave to say, if such feminine foundations had still continued, provided no vows were obtruded upon them (virginity is least kept where it is most constrained), haply the weaker sex (beside the avoiding modern inconveniences) might be heightened to a higher perfection than hitherto hath been attained. I say, if such feminine foundations were extant now of days, haply some virgins of highest birth would be glad of such places, and, I am sure, their fathers and elder brothers would not be sorry for the same. . . . Their hospitality was beyond compare, insomuch that Ovid (if living in that age), who feigned famine to dwell in Scythia, would have fancied feasting an inhabitant of English abbeyes. Especially in Christmas time, they kept most bountiful houses. Whosoever brought the face of a man, brought with him a patent for his free welcome, till he pleased to depart."—*Fuller*.

The above collection is from Lord John Manners' excellent pamphlet on National Holydays.

"His (Dr. Johnson's) respect for places of religious retirement was carried to the greatest degree of veneration. The Benedictine convent at Paris paid him all possible honours in return, and the Prior and he parted with tears of tenderness."—*Piozzi, Johnsoniana, 47—Convents*.

"As we walked in the cloisters (of St. Andrew's) there was a solemn echo, while he (Dr. Johnson) talked loudly of a proper retirement from the world. Mr. Nairne said, he had an inclination to retire. I called Dr. J.'s attention to this, that I might hear his opinion if it was right. JOHNSON.—Yes, when he has done his duty to society. In general, as every man is obliged not only to love God, but his neighbour as himself, he must bear his part in active life; yet there are exceptions. Those who are exceedingly scrupulous, (which I do not approve, for I am no friend to scruples) and find their scrupulosity invincible, so that they are quite in the dark, and know not what they shall do,—or those who cannot resist temptations, and find they make themselves worse by being in the world without making it better,—may retire. *I never read of a hermit but in imagination I kiss his feet; never of a monastery but I could fall on my knees and kiss the pavement.*"—*Boswell's Life of Johnson*, vol. iv. p. 59. Edit. Croker.

"[*Monasteria*] olim erant scholæ sacrarum literarum, et aliarum disciplinarum, quæ sunt utiles ecclesiæ, et sumebantur inde pastores et episcopi. Olim ad discendum conveniebant."—*Augsburg Confession, 1530. (The apology and explanation.)* [The whole article is directed only against the Romish abuse of religious houses, acknowledging their use; so also the *Confessio Saxonica*.]

"The lives of the conventuals abroad are mostly regular (I chiefly speak of those who are not obliged to roam about in quest of a precarious subsistence) and entirely free from those crying abuses with which ignorance or calumny have often charged them. Every essential breach of discipline which comes to light is most severely punished. Amongst the religious women there is usually much more happiness than in convents of the other sex. When from

their tender years they have been brought up to a life of piety, and have carefully been preserved from the society of men, from conversations, books, and objects, which awaken the senses and inflame the passions, they mostly continue happy and content, and are satisfied with that degree of tranquillity, and those innocent enjoyments which they meet with in these retreats. Some similar establishments to those of which we are here treating might, if under proper regulations, be rendered of acknowledged utility both to individuals and to society; but they should only be considered as a temporary refuge, and not be enforced by irrevocable engagements. Peculiar circumstances may render a few asylums *desirable in every country*."—*Hawkins on Celibacy*, pp. 129—133.

"If any of these societies do at all exist, I think they should be such alone as adhere to the primitive institution of the cenobitical life. They might, undoubtedly, be so calculated as to afford a comfortable asylum to those who, after having performed the duties owing to society, wish to conclude their days in peace, at a distance from the more distracting cares and bustles of life. But they should, at least, be only open to the few who, from peculiar inclination, or other personal circumstances, might be desirous of retiring to a quiet and temporary refuge, such as might either contribute to alleviate the grievances of affliction, or to facilitate their happiness."—*Ibid.* pp. 181, 182.

[The above two passages are the more remarkable, because they occur in an essay very violently, and often most objectionably, directed against the practice of clerical celibacy in the Roman church, from which the author was a convert.]

"I was yesterday evening at Oseney, now a desolate, dreary island inhabited by a solitary miller. Here were once assembled the hierarchy of the English Church! where swine now feed God has been solemnly adored; where the noise of reptiles now alone is heard did once resound the pious requiem for a departed soul, on the majestic laud of omnipotent goodness! Here learning was cultivated, education improved;—here was a retreat for grief, or sickness of heart, and weariness of life;—here the poor were daily fed. If monks and friars were greater villains than malice, still unextinguished, represents them, we should mourn and lament their loss."—*Ext. of Letter from Barré Charles Roberts, Student of Christ Church*.—See *Memoirs of his Life*, p. 32.

[If some of the following quotations refer only to the virtue, or dignity, or whatever else it may be called, of the virgin life, still it must be plain, that any admissions or assertions of such dignity, or even of the allowableness of this estate, have a very obvious bearing upon the matter in hand; monastic institutions presuppose the celibate, and are but the legitimate and natural growth of it; whether it is a fitting subject of a *vow* does not enter into the essence of the life as such.]

Archbishop Sandys writes as follows, "There be, no doubt, that have the gift of chastity by birth; and there be that have made themselves chaste by endeavour: but of this all men are not capable. As it is the gift of God, so it seemeth to be a rare and not a common gift. Such as have it, and so live sole, *they are more fit to labour in God's Church*, it must needs be granted, for they are cumbered with fewer cares. But be these cares never so many and great, better it is to marry than to burn," &c.—[Sermons by Archbishop Sandys, Parker edition, p. 316.] He then passes on to the defence of Matrimony, which is the subject of his sermon, his text being Heb. xiii. 4. Yet amid much complaint against the real or supposed abuses of virginity, or of the profession of it, similar admissions with that just cited above are not wanting. Thus at page 328, he speaks of St. Paul as "giving the *highest commendation to single life*;" and again, at the conclusion of his sermon, the ability to maintain this life is spoken of as a "*gift*," which must of course be held to imply the obligation on the part of its recipients to cherish and to use it. Indeed, above, some encouragement is held out to persons to "*endeavour*" after it.

Bishop Andrewes, in his Exposition of the Ten Commandments, writing on the Seventh Commandment, chap. vii. speaks of "two virtues: 1. *castitas cœlibatus*, and 2. *castitas conjugalis*." Then he adds: "For the first there is no doubt but it is *better* than the other; either if we take it *simply*, he that giveth

not his virgin in marriage doth better; or, in regard of the present necessity, which is to be thought upon; for the Apostle would have men to be without carefulness." Then he assigns "the care and trouble of a family in a married estate," and the inability of "the married either to watch, or fast, or pray, without the other's consent," the comparative facility which a single man has in providing for himself, the likelihood of his being "more free from covetousness," and more exempt from "distraction," as reasons why "the chastity of single life is chiefly to be desired." And in his treatment of the Third Commandment, when dealing with the subject of vows, he holds their lawfulness, their use, and their necessity, and that a man's state of life is a lawful subject matter of a vow, the "*possibile*" being of course presupposed; and adds expressly, "Some disallow the vows made in former ages as not possible to be kept, as to vow single life; of which we may say, that to say all may do it, is dangerous; so to say that none may do it, is no less dangerous." And then he specifies certain means, in the use of which persons so minded may become enabled to do it safely and beneficially. An admission of the same nature is made by him in his Answer to the Eighteenth Chapter of Cardinal Perron's Reply, xiii. under the head of "*Marrying after vow of single life.*"

Bishop Mountague, in his Answer to the Gagger, seems to take a similar view (chap. xxxix.) "Your promise was, your undertaking is, to prove by express words of our own Bibles, that the vows of priests and religious persons touching single life, should be kept; and yet *neither do we deny the one, nor you prove the other.*" The whole chapter, if consulted, and also the xv. xvi. xvii. of his "*Just Appeal*," will be found to bear out this view more fully. But being not directly on this subject, it would be difficult to show this by extract, without citing more than can be done in a limited space.

Bishop Cosin has the following passage in his Sermon on the Marriage in Cana of Galilee: "Had not Christ vouchsafed His presence at this marriage men might have had cause to doubt, as they did in the Gospel, whether it were good to marry at all, or no; for first, He was a virgin Himself, and His Mother, she was a virgin; neither He nor she would lead any other lives; and married life itself seems to be but an imperfect state, *the state of perfection is virginity, so much commended by our Saviour, so highly esteemed by S. Paul.*"—*Cosin's Works*, vol. i. p. 56. Oxford edition, 1843.

Bishop Hall, in his defence of "The Honor of the Married Clergy," (Book i. sec. 2.) writes thus: "Neither did I ever derogate ought from sacred virginity; or lay it level, whether absolutely or in all circumstances, with holy matrimony." And in sec. v.; "Single life is good; the opinion of the necessity of single life, and the unlawfulness of the married, is anti-christian. What can be more plain? Yet this wilful slanderer tells the world, that I make the profession of continence anti-christian: whereas, we do willingly profess, that *true profession of true continency is truly laudable*: that the forcible imposition of it, as necessary to some state of men," &c. And again (sec. vii.) in a passage, which, considering to whom it is addressed, and by whom, and where, is *instar omnium*, he says, "We do, therefore, from our hearts, *honor true virginity as the most excellent estate of life which is incident to frail humanity.* Gerson hath taught us not to call it a virtue; but it is cousin-german to a virtue. *Neither do we think that the earth affords anything more glorious than eunuchism for the Kingdom of Heaven*: which is, therefore, commended by our Saviour, not as a thing merely arbitrary, by way of advice, but of charge to the able: *Qui potest capere capiat.* In this we can gladly subscribe to S. Chrysostom, *Bonum est virginitas*, &c. 'Virginity is good; I yield it: and *better than marriage*; I confess it.' Secondly, every man, therefore, not ecclesiastics only, should labour and strive to aspire unto this estate, as the better; using all holy means both to attain and to continue it. Neither do we think it any other than blameable, that young persons, not so much as advising with their own abilities, without all endeavour and ambition of so worthy a condition, leap rashly into the bands of wedlock. Thirdly, though every man must reach for it, yet every man cannot catch it: since it hath pleased God to reserve this, as a peculiar.

gift, for some persons; not intending it as a common favour to all suitors. Fourthly, those, then, which are, upon good trial, conscious to themselves of God's call to this estate, and his gift enabling them unto it, *may lawfully make profession thereof to the glory of the Giver*; and, if need be, *may vow*, God continuing the same grace unto them, *a holy perpetuation thereof*, to their end; the observation whereof, if they, through their own neglect, shall let fall, they *cannot be excused from sin*, or freed from censure."—*Hall's Works*, vol ix. pp. 168, 176, 180, 181; Oxford edition, 1837.

Perhaps it may not be quite out of place here, to observe, that the Act of Edward VI. by which the marriage of priests was made lawful, sets forth in the preamble, "that it is to be wished the clergy would live single, that they might be more at leisure to attend the business of their function;" and that this Act, as is remarked by Collier (from whom I quote), "goes no farther than a permission."—*Collier's Ecc. Hist.* vol. v. p. 304. Edition, 1840.

"What their (the primitive monks) bill-of-fare wanted in cheer, it had in grace; their life being constantly spent in prayer, reading, musing, and such like pious employments . . . It would do one good even but to think of their goodness, and at the rebound and second-hand to meditate on their meditations. For if ever poverty was to be envied it was here. And I appeal to the moderate men of these times,* whether in the heights of these woful wars they have not sometimes wished (not out of passionate distemper, but serious recollection of themselves) some such private place to retire unto, where, out of the noise of this clamorous world, they might have reposed themselves, and served God with more quiet."—*Fuller's Church History*, book vi. sect. 1.

"Those who founded and inhabited these monastic buildings were for ages the chief directors of the national mind. Their possessions were, in truth, the possessions of all classes of the people. The highest offices in those establishments were in some cases bestowed upon the noble and the wealthy, but they were open to the very humblest. *The studious and the devout found here a shelter and a solace.* The learning of the monastic bodies has been underrated; the ages in which they flourished have been called dark ages; but they were almost the sole depositaries of the knowledge of the land. They were the historians, the grammarians, the poets. They accumulated magnificent libraries. They were the barriers that checked the universal empire of brute force. They cherished an ambition higher and more permanent than could belong to the mere martial spirit. They stood between the strong and the weak. They held the oppressor in subjection to that power which results from the cultivation, however misdirected, of the spiritual parts of our nature. Whilst the proud baron continued to live in the same dismal castle that his predatory fathers had built or won, the Churchmen went on, from age to age, adding to their splendid edifices, and demanding a succession of ingenious artists to carry out their lofty ideas. The devotional exercises of their lips touched the deepest feelings of the human heart. Their solemn services, handed down from a remote antiquity, gave to music its most ennobling cultivation; and the most beautiful of arts thus became the vehicle of the loftiest enthusiasm."—*Knight's Life of Shakspeare*, pp. 184, 185.

"It was this principle (*i. e.* the surrender of this individual to the public will) transferred into the bosom of the Church, which produced the monasteries—a salutary and sustaining principle, till it was perverted to destroy the sense of personal responsibility. For it would be hard to find a good reason against the introduction of such a principle into a religious rule of life. If a man is led to give up some portion of his *natural* liberty for the sake of the advantages he derives from being a member of a well-regulated state, how much more may he make a free-will offering of some parts of his *christian* liberty, if he thus becomes enrolled in a community whose orderly life, regulated by well-advised

* Those of the great rebellion. The thoughtful reader will mark how strongly these yearnings come in aid of the assertion, that monasticism has its root in the principles and feelings of our common nature.

restrictions, is conducive to a perfection not easily attainable amidst the distractions of the world. . . . With regard to the errors of the monastic system, they have been unsparingly exposed; and, as far as they were the fruit of the system, no man will plead in their defence. But still it may be questioned whether any other foundations of human institution are on record which for so long a period contrived, by their public advantages, to counterbalance their defects. This, at least, is certain, that from the planting of Christianity among our British and Saxon ancestors, till their fatal decline in the 15th century, there was no period at which their influence was not the chief conservative power in society. The monasteries were the nurseries of education, the asylums of the afflicted, the seats of judicature, the record offices of law. Here our monarchs kept their court at the times of the Church's solemn festivals—here the nobles and knights assembled at the summons of the king to meet in parliament; and the spiritual and temporal peers conferred to preserve, by their counsels, the balance of the State. Here were trained the future rulers of the Church, and the statesmen who first set bounds to the will of imperious despots, and laid the foundation for civil liberty by establishing the prerogatives of religion. Here were the secure abodes of divines, philosophers, historians, and poets, inventors of rare arts which have since been lost to the world, but of which the fruit may yet partially be seen in the storied window, and in the pictured missal. Here, lastly, were the studies of those architects whose skill was directed by a nobleness of conception and design, such as the world never saw before nor since. And yet so little were they in their own esteem, that scarcely in a few instances did they leave their names to be known, or to invite the praise of posterity. We neither can nor would blot from remembrance these benefits:—we acknowledge those who conferred them to be the lights and glory of their time; and to their care in cherishing the records of learning, while the world around neglected them, we owe much of the returning civilization which has since been extended over the western shores of our quarter of the globe.”—*Rev. E. Churton: Introduction to the Monastic Remains of Yorkshire.*

“Christianity was not once that umbratile thing, that feeble exotic, shut up in churches, and parsonages and parlours; but walked abroad, made the multitude both the receivers, the collectors, and distributors of her bounties; compelled cities to wear her livery, and dared to inherit the earth. She once provided *homes and forms of operation for the heroic virtues, for lofty aims and firm resolves*, making their torrents flow in the manifold channels of mercy, instead of suffering them to waste the land with a hateful magnificence. She once gave names, and methods, and ancient sanctions, and solemn order, and venerable holiness, and every quality men love and obey, to the pious bearers of spiritual aid to the ignorant and the poor. . . . She once did so combine and temper these works of benevolence with other holy employments, with *frequent daily prayer and oft-heard choral praise*, that the social acts of temporal and ghostly relief seemed no separate, adventitious work, no petty craft of artificial goodness, no capricious adventure or trick of interference, but rather flowing from a something holy, natural, and complete in all its parts. She once had officers, and employment for all; that all, however humble in rank or wealth, or mental culture, might be personally interested in the Church's work. She once could claim her own from every rank, teach all her holy characters, make all acknowledge her marks and passports of sacredness and authority. We cannot bring back those days again;—who would wish that *man* should have this power?—but still *they may come back to us*. The times are dark, and a curtain of gloom hangs over the future; but on its dark face we may discern, brightening in prismatic hue, a vision of past beauty,—the Holy Catholic Church.”—*British Critic*, No. LVI. p. 370, quoted by Mr. Paget—“Warden of Berkinholt,” Preface.*

* We owe a sincere apology to Mr. Paget for having admitted in our last collection of testimonies, a misquotation from his “*Tales of a Village*.” Our contributor

A Prayer for the use of those who are seeking the Revival of Conventual Piety in the Church of England.

O Almighty God and Saviour, who art head over all things to Thy Church, and the author and giver of every good gift, we beseech Thee, of Thine infinite mercy, to look favourably on the designs of those who are seeking to revive in this Church the spirit of primitive retirement from the world, piety, charity, humility, and self-denial. Four out upon them, we beseech Thee, a more abundant measure of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may become in themselves examples of those graces which they would recommend to others; and so temper their piety with soberness, and their zeal with discretion, that they may give no occasion to any adversary to blaspheme, nor by any rash or erroneous proceeding bring discredit upon the great design before them.

And as we humbly trust this stirring of so many hearts is from Thy Holy Spirit, give, we beseech Thee, such grace and wisdom to the rulers of this Church that they may not oppose their motions, lest, haply, they be found to fight against God. And do Thou, who art the author of unity and order in all the Churches of the saints, let our confidence that this is Thy work be confirmed by the harmony of design and operation amongst those devoted to it. May none seek to advance their own private views, but each be ready to sacrifice all selfish considerations to the furtherance of the common end; that thus, through their endeavours, aided by Thy blessing, the eyes of Heaven, and pilgrims, may once more behold within this Church a model upon earth of the Heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the Living God.

And grant, O Lord, that the spectacle thus offered may not be lost upon any who shall witness it, but that many beholding this example of holiness in heart and life,—of meekness and wisdom,—of overflowing charity,—of unworldliness of spirit,—of taking up and bearing the cross,—may confess and show their deeds, may abjure the service of the god of this world, and be turned from practising the works of the flesh, to bring forth those fruits of the Spirit, which are, by Jesus Christ, to the praise and glory of God.

Finally, we beseech Thee, to put it into the hearts of those who have this world's goods, or to whose hands the patrimony of the Church may cleave, by charitable gifts or just restitution in aid of this advancement of Thy kingdom upon earth, to make for themselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, and to lay up in store a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life. And do thou so direct the counsels of our civil governors, that all legal obstacles to the free exercise of such acts of piety and charity may speedily be done away.

O Lord, hear—O Lord, forgive our unworthiness, through our past sacrileges, of this inestimable gift—O Lord, hearken and do—for the sake of Thy Church, which is called by Thy name, and which Thou hast purchased with Thine own blood. These prayers and supplications we humbly offer in the name and through the mediation of Him, in whom Thou art always well pleased, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MR. MAURICE'S KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

SIR,—IN common with other of your readers, I have very much regretted to see in some of the recent numbers of the *CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER*, the writings of the Rev. F. Maurice held up to the admiration of your readers, with very little, if any, qualification or

must have received it, we imagine, through some corrupted channel. As written and printed by Mr. Paget, the passage reads just as it should do, as follows:—"If the monasteries, instead of being swept away, had been reformed—had been reserved for persons," &c.

warning. In the last number, in the article "Signs of Hope," (p. 179,) we are told that Mr. M.'s "Kingdom of Christ is, perhaps, one of the greatest treasures of the age," and much more is there said in his praise.

It would be presumptuous in any one to say that this work is not in some respects a remarkable work, and indicates considerable powers in the author, since it has undoubtedly attracted the favourable notice of many able men. At the same time it is equally certain, that a very different opinion of its merits is entertained by others, whose character for intellectual power, and still more for enlightened and thoughtful orthodoxy, entitles them to much weight.

This being the case, I think it is scarcely fair to hold up a work so questioned, to the unqualified admiration of the readers of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER. For my own part, I feel very strongly, with many others, the unsound and dangerous character of Mr. Maurice's writings, and of his tone as a writer. I think, therefore, your readers ought to be told that there is another opinion prevailing on the subject from that lately expressed so strongly in your pages—a very opposite opinion; and that among those who, on the whole, much approve the Remembrancer, and who stand high in the esteem of the school of which it is an organ.

I would, therefore, protest against the continued admission of such praises of Mr. Maurice and his works, and entreat you to consider whether it is wise or right to commit your Review to the writings of this gentleman, knowing that such difference of opinion exists as to his merits. I do not wish to prevent Mr. M.'s works from being read; I do not mean that nothing is to be learned from them; but I do object to the pages of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER being made the instrument of commending them to the favourable prejudices of your more unguarded readers.

I might content myself with having said thus much, and I will, if you please, be content with thus much appearing in your next, as a protest; but I am quite ready to state the ground of my opinions, if I may be permitted to do so, and it is not thought undesirable to do so, in your pages. To me, I confess this rather appears a desirable plan. It seems fair that the strictures should have an opportunity of overtaking the praises; and there is a precedent for such a proceeding in one of your late Numbers. I am the more disposed to do so, as it might elicit—what I have never yet been able to learn—the grounds on which Mr. Maurice's work is considered so able and excellent. With your permission, then, I will now make some remarks on Mr. Maurice's work, "The Kingdom of Christ."

Before I begin, let me assure the writer of the article, "Signs of Hope," that, although I may not be one of the few "*competent* to read" it, I have laboured to understand it. I do not pretend that I have invariably succeeded—I have not; and therefore I suppose, in self-defence, I might be tempted to accuse Mr. M. of being very misty sometimes, and of using words for thoughts, and so on; and this is one objection, which I own that I feel, to the work. But it is when I do seem to understand him, when I do see a meaning, that I object to that meaning. I may still be mistaken; but I will now give

instances of what I mean, which will at least show Mr. M.'s friends what kind of objections are felt to his writings, and why; and will give them an opportunity of vindicating him.

I begin, then, with his Preface to the first edition of his work—the only one I have seen, but which we are told is not superseded by the second. In this Preface, Mr. M. is engaged in stating, incidentally, the nature of his work, and why he has discussed it; and he seeks to defend himself from certain imputations that had been made upon him. This would seem, therefore, a particularly favourable portion of the work for arriving at a fair estimate of Mr. Maurice's opinions and principles. Let us see.

Mr. M. begins by observing, that the questions, "Is there a Catholic Church?—what are its principles and constitution?" have, from circumstances, forced themselves on the attention of all men. He shows how three different classes of men are led in a different way to these same questions. He "thinks it will be allowed that their cases include most of the forms of thought which prevail." He then proceeds to give the answers of each of these three classes of men to these questions. The first is nearly as follows:—Is there a Catholic Church?—and what are its principles and constitution? "We refer you," say one class of intelligent and thoughtful divines, "to the centuries which immediately followed the coming of our Lord in the flesh. To those ages in which lived the men who had conversed with Christ's own Apostles, received their traditions, imbibed their spirit, suffered their persecutions;—when men received mysteries with reverence, when the ministers spoke as those who had authority, and the people thought it their chief duty to receive their words, and bring forth the fruits of them in their lives;—when the dignity of sacraments, and the importance of ordination and consecration, were recognised and felt;—when the conditions and methods of a holy life were understood, and men fashioned themselves according to the rule of the Church, rather than by their own caprice. Then the Church was indeed a Church, one in itself, and Catholic. Since then it has fallen indeed, but it may be restored; and the early ages are our pattern: we must look to them, and gather from them the true principles and constitution of the Church, if we would restore it in our own age to its purity and strength, for the blessing of our people."

I have departed a little from Mr. M.'s own words, but only where they seemed to be an exaggeration or caricature of the opinions intended. The answer is essentially the same; and surely it is in substance saying that "*the Catholic Church*," commonly so called, is that Catholic Church which men are seeking for.

Mr. M. then gives two other answers to the question; one, the liberal creed of the day; the other, that of the Plymouth Brethren, I believe, and others. He then says, that he "is persuaded" that few even of those who hold either of those three doctrines "are so content with them as not at times to be ready to abandon them." He "is equally sure" that they would "resist the intrusion of any new doctrine affecting to displace its predecessors." He proposes, therefore, to "look at the facts of the case as presented by each of these

disputants, and to gather from them *hints of an older, simpler doctrine*, which, excluding neither, shall embrace all, and exhibit a church which shall satisfy the whole nature of man, and be a mirror of the glory of God." "My object," he says, "is only to trace the 'hints' of this doctrine."

This is an analysis of Mr. M.'s preface so far; and now what are we to conclude from this, but that Mr. M. does not consider *the Catholic doctrine of the Catholic Church*, as it has been taught or held in any age by any authors, a satisfactory answer to the question, Is there a Catholic Church adequate to the wants of human nature? It is impossible to avoid this conclusion, if there be a meaning at all in what is there said. Mr. M. asks the question in the most pointed way, Is there a Catholic Church? He gives in answer a doctrine, which most persons must understand to represent what is commonly called the Catholic or High Church doctrine; he charges upon this the same kind of imperfection that belongs to two other doctrines, which are heresies; and when he comes to give his own answer, he does not allude to *any other doctrine* existing as worth mentioning, he does not speak of expounding the *true Catholic doctrine* of the Catholic Church; but he proposes to collect from the facts of the case a doctrine "older, simpler, more comprehensive, more complete, more satisfactory!" including in its embrace the opinions and views of Catholics and heretics equally! I ask, with this declaration before us, can we think this author a sound member or safe teacher of *THE Catholic Church*—not of *A Catholic Church* in some enlarged Maurician sense—but in the actual and ordinary sense of that term? Is this a book to put into the hands of the many, or of any, with words of high praise?"

Your contributor seems to say that Mr. Maurice comes to the *same conclusion* as his contemporaries, the Catholic writers of the day, as to the doctrine of the Church. But this is surely a mistake; unless Mr. M. himself has made a mistake, or failed in his undertaking. The views and principles of these writers are contained substantially under Mr. M.'s first supposed answer. At least he thought so, or he would not have neglected to mention the opinion of writers of some note surely in this day, and supported by the authority of many of a former day. *Their* object and wish is to explain and restore the *old doctrine*, the ancient principles and constitution of the Church. Mr. M., on the other hand, comes forward in the character of a discoverer of something old at once and new. His predecessors have failed in solving the great problem of the Catholic Church. He is about to give us *his* notions or "hints" of what the Catholic Church really is or should be. He does not deny that this doctrine has been held in part by others—different persons possessing different fragments—that it has existed in germ and embryo always—but has not been held consciously and completely, not put together and viewed as a whole, in the due relation of all its parts and functions to all the various wants of man, as these "hints" will serve to exhibit it! This may be very original, very clear, very profound; but it is Catholic only in the most un-catholic sense, in the most abused sense of that much-abused word. I do not wish to speak strongly, but I feel that such

language and such sentiments as these deserve as strong reprobation as your contributor seems to think they deserve praise and admiration.

But such an undertaking as that thus avowed by Mr. Maurice, besides its other graver faults, would seem naturally to bring down upon the author a suspicion of a very unusual share of presumption and self-conceit. To discover in the writings of every different and opposing writer, "the blessing each one can, which the other cannot give," to look at every system and doctrine on "its fair and illuminated side;" and from this examination and survey, to collect a simpler, sublimer, and more comprehensive doctrine than has ever been reached or embraced by any writer; really does seem a somewhat presumptuous attempt—and does indeed suggest a suspicion that the author is almost "the most self-conceited of human creatures." Mr. M. is aware of this, and therefore proceeds at this point of his preface, (p. xxiv.) to guard his readers against such a mistake; a mistake which, "by a very slight and moderate injustice," they may easily be guilty of. Let us now see what he has to say in vindication of himself from such an odious charge.

It would be a mistake, he says, to suppose that he is one "who wishes to place himself above all sects and parties, that from a calm elevation he may behold, and smile with complacency at their errors." This would be a mistake; for the truth is, he only "wishes to place himself where he may receive the light from all (sects and parties), because he feels himself so dark and ignorant, that he cannot spare one ray of it." This is Mr. M.'s own account of the position he assumes himself to be in,—the position from which he dictates that greatest treasure of the age, "The Kingdom of Christ." That is, he *only* assumes to have placed himself at a point from whence he can see the fair and illuminated side of every doctrine and system. The rays from each converge to a focus on him. He is all over radiant with this reflected light. This is his position—this is the matter of fact. In speaking then as if he has the light and advantage of each and all, it must not be thought that he is conceited. He *has* all the light indeed. But what then? he only *received* it from them. His *only* advantage, his *only* peculiar claim is, that while each party has *its own* ray or rays; he has, from a humble sense of his own darkness, *collected them all*.

Again, he says, it must not be supposed that he is "putting himself in the place of a teacher, but of a learner; he is not assuming to be wiser than his neighbours, but is anxious to sit at their feet; he is not angry with them for presuming to teach him, but only because they will not admit any wisdom but their own." "I do not complain," he says, "of any for what they hold of truth, but for not holding what others have, and they have not," &c. &c. That is, he *only learns from all* what each has to teach him,—he sits at their feet from a sense of his own ignorance, to observe what each has of truth; and then, if with this advantage he proceeds to point out to each, how far he is right, and how far wrong, he does not assume to be a teacher, but is indeed, in the truest sense, a learner. True, he does come to *teach all* at last, but then he only teaches what he has *learnt*.

It would be a mistake, therefore, to say he is self-conceited, though "by a very slight and moderate injustice," he may be so represented. No, it is his "sense of his own ignorance" that obliges him to learn *from all, all* that they have to teach!

I do not know what effect this vindication may have on others, to me it is the most curious proof of the thing to be disproved that could be imagined; and I can truly say that I cannot feel that I have really caricatured his own account, nor do more than express, in other words, what it contains. I must add that, for my own part, I never in all my life saw any one, or read anything that exhibited such wonderful self-conceit as the writings of Mr. Maurice generally; while it is made more wonderful still, by the calm, complacent way in which he thinks he disproves by simply denying the fact.

In these remarks I have confined myself to the preface of the work, purposely avoiding all extracts from, or allusions to, the work itself, because I wish to be definite; and I wish what I write to be brought at once to book; and this preface consists of only a few pages of large print, which any one can read for himself in a few minutes. And, for the sake of being definite, I will now sum up and repeat the propositions which I consider this preface to contain, and to which I object. It implies or states 1st, That the true and adequate doctrine on the subject of "the Holy Catholic Church" has never yet been held or taught. 2d, That even the most Catholic doctrine as taught by Catholic divines, is only a partial and imperfect statement of it. 3d, That the doctrines of heretics and schismatics are partial and imperfect in the same way, perhaps a little more so. 4th, That the true doctrine lies not in any one of these doctrines in opposition to the others; nor in a doctrine independent of and distinct from all; but in one which is older, simpler, deeper, more complete and satisfactory than any, and *comprehends and includes all*, holding them each in its proper place and connexion, and in harmony with each other. 5th, That Mr. Maurice has possession of this COMPREHENSIVE DOCTRINE, and is about to trace "the hints" of it in this book. And 6th, In making this assertion, and avowing this intention, he is not presumptuous nor self-conceited. Each of these propositions are really contained or stated in Mr. M.'s preface, and are indeed a just, and only a just explanation of the whole drift and matter of the work, in which they occur again and again in every form. Mr. Maurice seems to feel that if he can be fairly chargeable with presumption and self-conceit in this avowal and design, such a charge would be both odious to himself and fatal to his work. I think so too; and must think *this imputation alone* conclusive against him and his work, until I can be made to understand how an individual who assumes to have now, first and alone, discovered the one idea of the Catholic Church which includes and embraces all other ideas of it; who calmly asserts this; whose one only professed object it is to exhibit this idea; how such an individual is either not the most gifted or inspired of men, or "the most self-conceited of human creatures."

Of course, I feel that I am laying myself open to the imputation of being one of those who, the writer of the article, "Signs of Hope," says, are "not competent to read" this work: and "whose reasoning

powers are too unexercised to receive such a banquet of pure concentrated thought." But really, this scarcely seems a fair or courteous way of settling such a matter. It is begging the question by the assumption, on the part of the writer, that his is one of the very few most highly-gifted minds that are competent to understand Mr. M.'s writings, and savours strongly of the very temper which I have been pointing out in Mr. Maurice. However, I shall be much obliged to any of those whose minds have been "deeply possessed and mightily moulded" by Mr. M.'s work, if they will interpret it to my less-gifted self. I shall be very happy to be obliged to admit that Mr. Maurice is orthodox as well as original, and that he is not conceited in spite of appearances.

If what I have here said against Mr. Maurice's preface to his book be not wholly a misconception of his meaning, we must expect from such principles, and such a tone of mind, their natural consequences in the work itself; and this expectation will, I believe, be found correct. I will, however, stop here—for the present, at least. Should time and opportunity be afforded me, I may, at some future time, go on to state other objections to Mr. M.'s particular opinions, and shall be very glad, if, by so doing, I may obtain a complete explanation of what appears so objectionable, not to myself only, but to many others.

Feb. 15.

I am, &c. &c.

[We have admitted the above communication for much the same reason that the article "Signs of Hope," of which it complains, went unaltered to the press; *i. e.* because both that writer and his present censor are perfectly able and ready both to form, to express, and to defend their respective opinions of any theological book. The eulogist of Mr. Maurice is so much more deeply read than most of us in Mr. Maurice's somewhat subtle speculations, that it would have seemed almost presumptuous to object to the particular, though strong phraseology of a contributor, to whom, perhaps, more than all others, the "Remembrancer" is indebted. At the same time it is possible that such praise might be overstrained and excessive. The objections which we foresaw were not unlikely to occur, however, may probably be best met by giving Mr. Maurice, his friends, and censors, fair lists for their differences. And if the discussion, which seems likely to ensue, shall have only the benefit of bringing out, in an intelligible form, that on which such widely different opinions have been formed, as the *real* character of Mr. Maurice's works, the objectionable praise itself—if objectionable it shall be proved—will have done good service to the Church. It has always seemed a healthy state and condition of a Review, that its contributors should not be too much controlled (though of course restricted within due limits); and we have yet to learn that the writer of "Signs of Hope," even if it be shown that he overpraised Mr. Maurice, overstept the conventional licence willingly accorded to independent thinkers in any Review. The "Christian Remembrancer" is, and ought to be, the transcript of many minds. But while once more sanctioning the dangerous principle of admitting strictures on our own strictures, of which our present correspondent so adroitly takes advantage; or, in other words, while we abandon editorial infallibility, so far, at least, as to profess little acquaintance with Mr. Maurice, we intend to exercise a most tyrannical supremacy, by putting a stop to the proposed discussion, whenever, and for whatever reasons we please.]

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS APPOINTED.

BP. OF GLOUC. & BRISTOL, *April 14.*
 BP. OF ROCHESTER, *in April.*
 BP. OF CHICHESTER, *June 2.*
 BP. OF EXETER, *June 2.*
 BP. OF LINCOLN, *June 2.*

BP. OF PETERBOROUGH, *June 2.*
 BP. OF SALISBURY (for B. & W.) *June 2.*
 BP. OF LICHFIELD, *June 2.*
 BP. OF ELY, *June 9.*
 BP. OF WORCESTER, *July 21.*

ORDINATIONS.

By the LORD BP. OF LONDON, at the Chapel Royal, St. James's, on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—L. J. Bernays, B.A. St. John's; E. B. Heawood, B.A. Ch. Ch. (i. d. Abp. of Canterbury); L. S. Dudman, B.A. Wad. (i. d. Abp. of Canterbury).

Of Cambridge.—W. L. Hardisty, B.A. St. John's; W. Way, B.A. Trin.; T. A. Pope, B.A. Jesus; W. B. Faulkner, B.A. Sid. Sus.

Literates.—(For Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions.)—H. Laurence, C. W. Noesgen.

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—H. Robbins, B.A. Wad.; M. Shaw, B.A. Brasen.; W. Cobb, B.A. Ch. Ch.; J. Yarker, B.C.L. New Inn H. (the last three i. d. Abp. of Canterbury.)

Of Cambridge.—J. F. Spong, B.A. Caius, and G. Beardsworth, M.A. St. John's (i. d. Abp. of Canterbury).

Literate.—(For Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions.)—J. Hunter, Church Missionary College, Islington.

By the LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER, at Chester, on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—R. C. Black, B.A. Worc.; F. A. La Trobe Foster, B.A. Oriel; W. H. Jones, B.A. Queen's; R. S. Redfern, B.A. Queen's; E. Roys, B.A. King's H. and Brasen.; E. Tomlinson, B.A. Trin.; A. G. Woolward, B.A. Magd.; E. Walker, B.A. Pem.

Of Cambridge.—W. Chawner, B.A. St. John's; S. J. Lyon, B.A. Trin.; T. Troughton, B.A. Trin.; J. R. Whyte, B.A. Downing.

Of St. Bees.—H. T. Fletcher, W. R. P. Wandby, T. Wilson.

Of Lampeter.—H. T. Downman.

Of Dublin.—J. Batson, B.A. Trin.; C. R. Huson, B.A. Trin.; T. Ireland, B.A. Trin.; J. Richardson, B.A. Trin.

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—C. R. Clifton, B.A. Mert.; R. Fletcher, B.A. Brasen.; W. B. Garnett, B.A. Brasen.; W. T. Redfern, Magd. H.; J. Rigg M.A. New Inn H.

Of Cambridge.—J. Appleton, B.A. Cath. H.; T. Massey, B.A. Cath. H.; P. Thompson, B.A. Cath. H.; W. Shackleton, B.A. Cath. H.; W. A. Cartledge, B.A. St. John's; J. P. Firmin, B.A. Queen's; J. P. Power, B.A. Queen's; W. C. Greene, B.A. Clare H.; C. J. G. Jones, B.A.

Clare H.; C. B. Jeaffreson, B.A. Pem.; S. G. F. Perry, Trin.; J. D. Raven, B.A. St. Mary Magdalen; J. B. Turner, B.A. Caius.

Of St. Bees.—J. Beilby, W. Hughes, W. H. Jones, J. D. Lateward, T. Sabine.

Of Dublin.—P. Reynolds, B.A. Trin.; R. F. J. Shea, M.A. Trin.; G. A. G. Warner, B.A. Trin.

By the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD, at All Souls' Church, Langham-place, St. Margy-bone, on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—G. M. Houghton, B.A. Linc.; J. H. A. Herries, B.A. Trin.

Of Cambridge.—H. J. Stokes, B.A. St. John's; J. Hall, B.A. Corp. Chris.

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—W. G. Holmes, B.A. Wad.; S. W. Steedman, B.A. Ch. Ch.; W. H. Skrine, B.A. Ch. Ch. (i. d. Bp. of Rochester.)

Of Cambridge.—B. Pidcock, B.A. Corp. Chris.; W. Rawson, B.A. St. John's; H. B. Greenwood, B.A. St. Cath. H.; J. M. Pratt, B.A. St. John's; J. Bradshaw, B.A. St. Cath. H.; J. Rushton, B.A. St. John's; J. F. Harward, B.A. St. John's.

Of Dublin.—R. W. Houghton, B.A. Trin.

By the LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY, at Salisbury, on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—G. A. Oddie, B.A. Univ.; J. F. Stuart, M.A. Trin.; H. Thompson, B.A. Magd. H., and J. J. T. S. Cocks, B.A. Brasen. (i. d. Bp. of Exeter).

Of Cambridge.—F. J. Biddulph, B.A. Em.; T. W. Dowding, B.A. Caius; P. W. Molesworth, B.A. St. John's, H. S. Aubyn, St. John's, B.A. and S. Dennis, B.A. Trin. (the last three i. d. Bp. of Exeter).

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—W. Grey, B.A. Magd. H.; J. N. Hinxman, B.A. Trin.; G. Nutt, B.A. Wor.; G. E. Cole, B.A. St. Mary H.; T. Dyson, jun. M.A. New Inn H.; J. C. Earle, B.A. St. Edm. H.; R. H. W. Miles, B.A. Ch. Ch.; G. D'Oyly Snow, B.A. St. Mary H.; N. Lowe, B.A. Queen's; H. R. Fortescue, B.A. Exet.; G. B. Northcote, M.A. Exet., and G. E. Symonds, B.A. Linc. (the last four i. d. Bp. of Exeter).

Of Cambridge.—J. J. Evans, M.A. Trin.; E. C. Wilshire, B.A. (i. d. Bp. of Exeter).

Of Durham.—W. Haslam, B.A. Univ.

By the LORD BISHOP OF RIPON, at Ripon,
on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—D. Wright, B.A. Magd. H.; J. Swire, B.A. Univ.
Of Cambridge.—E. W. Cook, B.A. St. John's; J. H. Pollexfen, B.A. Queen's; C. Sangster, B.A. St. John's.
Of Dublin.—W. D. Wade, B.A. Trin. (l. d. Bp. of Kildare.)
Literates.—R. Ellis and P. Eggleston, St. Bees.

PRIESTS.

Of Cambridge.—A. J. W. Morrison, B.A. Trin.
Of Dublin.—W. Cockett, B.A. Trin.
Literates.—W. Cross.

By the LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH, at
Peterborough, on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—W. Hombersley, M.A. Ch. Ch.; N. J. Moody, B.A. Oriel.
Of Cambridge.—C. T. Glyn, B.A. Trin.; J. Levett, B.A. Cath. H.; W. J. Marshall, B.A. Queen's; M. O. Norman, Corp. Chris.; C. Pratt, Jun. B.A. Trin.; G. E. Welby, B.A. Trin.; R. V. Whibby, M.A. Em.; A. T. Hudson, B.A. Jesus (l. d. Bp. of Norwich.)
Of Dublin.—S. Jervois, B.A. Trin.

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—F. Baron de Paravicini, B.A. Worc.; T. N. Twopeny, B.A. Oriel.
Of Cambridge.—P. L. Smith, M.A. St. John's.

By the LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN, at Lincoln,
on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—A. Kent, B.A. Oriel; A. Kinloch, B.A. St. Mary H.; J. Mason, B.A. New Inn H.; P. Newington, B.A. Worc.
Of Cambridge.—H. Howard, B.A. Magd.; R. W. Sheldon, B.A. Trin.; W. Talman, B.A. Fell. of King's; H. Wortham, B.A. Jesus.
Of Dublin.—H. M. Archdall, B.A. Trin. (l. d. Bp. of Down, Connor, and Dromore).

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—A. R. Pain, B.A. Pem.
Of Cambridge.—T. Crossland, B.A. Sid. Sus.; E. G. Jarvis, M.B. Trin.

By the LORD BISHOP OF WORCESTER, at Har-
tlebury Castle, on Sunday, March 3.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—C. B. Calley, B.A. Wor.; F. Tate, M.A. Univ.
Of Cambridge.—J. Hardy, Queen's; C. Turner, B.A. St. John's.

PREFERMENTS.

Name.	Preferment.	Diocese.	Patron.	Val.	Fop.
Barker, W. G.....	Matlock, R.....	Lichfield ...	D. of Lincoln	£320	3782
Barlow, J.....	Guildford	Winchester	Lord Chancellor	171	...
Barlow, —	Shalford w. Bramley, v.....	Winchester	Lord Chancellor	330	996
Bassett, C.....	Monknash, P.C.....	Llandaff	Hon. W. B. Grey.....	67	109
Bayly, E. G.....	Langton-Matravers, R.....	Sarum	Rev. J. Dampier.....	351	762
Beaumont, J. A.....	St. Mary, Leeds, P.C....	Ripon	Dr. Hook	47	...
Bowles, A.	Send w. Ripley, v.....	Winchester	Earl Onslow	260	1538
Broadley, A.....	Bradpole, v.....	Sarum.....	Lord Chancellor	199	1357
Bryan, R.....	Chilton, R.....	Exeter.....	Hon. N. Fellowes	114	90
Carnegie, J.....	Bishopstone, v.....	Chichester...	Bishop of Chichester ..	83	288
Cole, F.....	Issey, v.....	Exeter.....	D. & C. of Exeter	246	748
Corfe, J.	St. Petrock, R.....	Exeter.....	D. & C. of Exeter	138	662
Crosthwaite, J. C.....	(St. Andrew Hubbard, Ann, St. Mary-at-hill)	London	D. of Northumberland.	387	1318
Crowley, J. C.....	St. John's, R.....	Exeter.....	Hon. R. P. Carew	179	149
Cubitt, G. I.....	(St. Thomas, R. Win- chester	Winchester	Bp. of Winchester	145	3071
Dennis, R. N.....	East Blatchington, R.....	Chichester...	John King, Esq.....	88	163
Driffild, G. T.	Stratford-le-Bow, R.	London	Brasen. Coll., Oxford...	319	4626
Edon, J. F.....	Redmarsh, R.	Durham	Bishop of Durham	841	272
Ellman, E. B.....	Wartling, v.....	Chichester...	Rev. J. Pratt	307	962
Gibson, B.....	(St. Mary Abchurch, R. w. St. Lawrence Pountney	London.....	Corp. Chris. Coll., Camb.	206	526
Gruber, C. S.....	Westport, P.C.....	B. & W.....
Gunning, J. W. ...	East Boldre, P.C.....	Winchester
Hall, J. R.....	Frodsham, v.....	Chester.....	Ch. Ch., Oxford	590	5821
Hodgson, E. F. ...	Holton, R.....	Lincoln.....	C. Turner, Esq.....	334	191
Jones, H.....	Holywell, v.....	St. Asaph... Jesus Coll., Oxford	250	10834
Maxwell, M. H.....	Frampton, v.....	Sarum	R. B. Sheridan, Esq. ...	120	391
Oakes, H. A. A.....	Nowton, v.....	Ely	Marquis of Bristol	314	171
Overton, J.	Rothwell, R.....	Lincoln	Lord Yarborough	250	290
Price, —	Wishley w. Syrford.....	Winchester	Earl Onslow	210	155
Ray, G.....	Statherne, R.....	Peterboro'..	St. Peter's Coll., Camb.	566	849
Richardson, J.....	Heywood, P.C.....	Chester.....	Rector of Bury.....	196	...

PREFERMENTS—Continued.

Name.	Preferment.	Diocese.	Patron.	Fal.	Pop.
Scott, F. T.	Eastbridge, n.	Canterbury.	Archbp. of Canterbury.	73	22
Scott, R.	Duloe, <i>sin.</i> v.	Exeter.	Balliol College.	50	...
Smith, G.	Cantley, v.	York.	J. W. Childers, Esq.	233	651
Smith, H.	Butlers Marston, v.	Worcester.	D. & C. of Ch. Ch., Oxf.	88	313
Spring, G. T.	Hawling, n.	G. & B.	J. H. Hope, Esq.	100	217
Sutton, J. H.	Bishop's Hill, Sen. n.	York.	Lord Chancellor.	195	1302
Tetlow, J. R.	(Pontesbury, n. First Portion)	Hereford ..	Rev. H. Harrison.	800	1489
Thompson, W.	Bramley, v.	Winchester	Queen's Coll., Oxford..	385	428
Townley, R.	(St. Matthew, Liver- pool, F.C.)	Chester.	Rectors of Liverpool ...	107	...
Tucker, C.	Washford Pyne, n.	Exeter.	Rev. C. Tucker.	144	197
Westmorland, T. jun.	Sandal Magna, v.	Ripon.	Lord Chancellor.	157	3482

APPOINTMENTS.

Beamish, H. H.	{ Union of Kinsalebe & Grange, in the county of Waterford.	Meade, M.	{ Prebendal Stall of Coombe, Salisbury Cathedral.
Bridge, S.	{ Minister of Denmark-hill Proprietary Chapel.	Moore, J. C.	{ Archdeacon of the Isle of Man.
Clive, W.	Archdeacon of Montgomery.	O'Brien, M.	{ Prof. of Natural Philosophy & Astron. at K. Coll., London.
Harrison, J.	{ Head Master of the Andover Grammar School.	Slade, G.	{ Mastership of the Free Grammar School, Manchester.
Hill, J.	{ Head Master of the Royal Naval School, Greenwich.	Symonds, H.	{ Minor Canon of Norwich Cath.
Jones, J.	Archdeacon of Anglessea.	Traherne, J. M.	Chancellor of Llandaff.

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Ackland, T. G., D.D., Rector of St. Mildred's, Bread-street.	Langhorne, G.
Barrow, T., of Skirton.	Lister, J. S., Vicar of Luddington, Lincolnshire.
Burrows, S., Rector of Shinton.	Manby, J., M.A., Chaplain to his Royal Highness the late Duke of Sussex, and Vicar of Lancaster.
Bushe, W., Rector of St. George's par., Dublin.	Michell, J. H., Rector of Buckland.
Carlos, J., M.A., Rector of Thorpe-by-Hardiscoe, Norfolk.	Nash, J., of Flaxbournton.
Church, W., Rector of Woolthorpe.	Nicholls, D., Vicar of Llanegwad.
Cotton, G. H., Incumbent of St. Clement's, Rochdale.	Oxenham, W., Vicar of Cornwood, Devonshire, and Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral.
Cresswell, D., D.D., Vicar of Enfield.	Price, B., Tredegar.
D'Eve, N., Rector of Thrandeston.	Rhodes, C. H. R., of Barlborough Hall, near Chesterfield.
Fleming, G., M.A., of Christ's College, Camb.	Sparke, J., M.A., Curate of Wrawby cum Brigg, Lincolnshire.
Gilkes, W., Curate of Littlehampton.	Vawdrey, G., B.A., Incumbent of Wrenbury, Cheshire.
Glaister, W., late Vicar of Kirkby Fleetham.	Yolland, J., late Curate of Huxham.
Harling, J., M.A., Curate of St. Lawrence, Evesham, Worcestershire.	
Jackson, F. A., Vicar of Rical, near Selby.	
Jones, R., D.D., Vicar of Bedfont.	

PROCEEDINGS OF SOCIETIES.

INCORPORATED SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE ENLARGEMENT, BUILDING, AND REPAIRING OF CHURCHES AND CHAPELS.

A MEETING of this Society was held on Monday last, at their chambers in St. Martin's-place, Trafalgar-square, to take

NO. XL.—N. S.

into consideration a variety of applications from parishes and districts requesting assistance from the funds of

3 U

the Society to aid in the enlargement of old or the building of new Churches in places which are, as we shall see further on, sadly in want of church accommodation for the working classes of the people, and who are, therefore, left in the dangerous position of either not receiving any religious instruction, or of taking up any sort of dogmas that may be placed before them, whether good, bad, or indifferent; to obviate which awful state of things the constant and strenuous labours of the Society are directed.

His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury was called to the chair on that occasion; where, also, were present the Bishops of London, Chester, Bangor, Ely, Peterborough, Hereford, and Lichfield; Sir R. Harry Inglis, M.P.; the Reverends the Dean of Chichester, Dr. Spry, Dr. Shepherd, J. Jennings, and Benjamin Harrison; Messrs. F. H. Dickenson, M.P., William Davis; Newell Connop (the treasurer), Wm. Cotton, S. B. Brooks, James Cocks, A. Powell, &c.

The Chairmen of the sub-committees having made their respective reports, the meeting proceeded to investigate the cases referred to their consideration, and eventually voted assistance to the amount of 3,130*l.* towards the erection of seven additional churches or chapels; the rebuilding, with enlargement, of three existing churches; and the extension of the accommodation in eight other existing churches.

The situations where the additional places of worship are to be erected are the following:—Lower Cam, Gloucestershire; Brackmoor, parish of King's Winford, Staffordshire; Languic, Glamorganshire; New Radford, near Nottingham; Mosley, in the township of Congleton, Cheshire; Hazlewood, in the parish of Driffild, Derbyshire; and at Little Metros, near Tetsworth.

The churches to be rebuilt are at

Westmeon, Hampshire; Bathwell, Nottinghamshire; and Honly, near Huddersfield.

The churches where additional accommodation will be obtained by enlarging, reseating, &c. are at Wichen, Ely; Fowley, Hants; Kirkdale, near Liverpool; Tottington, parish of Bury, Lancashire; Austrey, Warwickshire; Ugmaston, Pembrokeshire; Full Sutton, Yorkshire; and Upton-cum-Chalvey, near Slough.

The population of the eighteen parishes thus assisted is 154,615 souls, for whom accommodation, to the extent of 25,595 sittings, is now provided in thirty-six churches and chapels, of which 7555 are free. To this most scanty provision of church room 5683 will now be added, including free seats for 4963 persons; thus it will be seen that the present places contain accommodation for only one-sixth of the population, while the free seats are only in the proportion of one sitting for twenty persons.

The meeting next examined the certificates relative to the completion of new churches, enlargement, &c. of existing churches in several parishes and districts. These have been approved. The treasurer received authority to pay the grant in each case.

The provision of church room in these parishes previously to the commencement of the works now reported to be completed, was only 2832 seats, 1226 of which were free, while the population amounted to 11,022 souls; but 1920 additional sittings are now provided, of which 1182 are free and unappropriated in perpetuity.

Since the last meeting of the committee, forms of application have been forwarded to eighteen applicants, to enable them to submit their cases to the consideration of the board. Five of these applicants will solicit aid towards the erection of additional churches in populous places.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

67, *Lincoln's Inn Fields.*

At the General Meeting, held on Tuesday, the 5th of March, 1844, the Rev. Dr. Russell in the chair, the minutes having been read, it was moved by J. C. Meymott, Esq.,

"That the Standing Committee be

requested to reconsider the course taken in regard to Bishop Ken's Manual, and Archdeacon Hale's work, as reported at the meeting in February."

This was seconded by N. Goldsmid, Esq., and carried.

The following report from the Tract

Committee to the Board was read to the Meeting:—

"The Tract Committee consider it due to themselves and to the Society at large to make the following report to the Board:

"The attention of the Tract Committee has been drawn to the prevalence of much dissatisfaction among members of the Society, with regard to the republication of the works of deceased authors, which had been adopted in their original state by the Society.

"The chief source of such dissatisfaction has been represented to them to be, a belief that the Tract Committee have been in the practice of making alterations as to doctrines, sentiments, and expressions, in the works of deceased authors, which had been adopted in their original state by the Society.

"Into the circumstances which may have given rise to such a belief the Tract Committee will not inquire, wishing to confine themselves to a statement of the facts with which they have been themselves connected.

"The Tract Committee was first appointed in the year 1834, a provision being made by the Board that all books and tracts should be referred to such Tract Committee, in like manner as they had been referred to the Standing Committee.

"In consequence of this resolution, some tracts which had been previously objected to at the Board, were referred to the Tract Committee for revision; and within the period which elapsed between their appointment and March, 1836, other tracts, against which objections were in like manner made at the Board, were by the Board referred to the Tract Committee.

"The Tract Committee accordingly examined such books and tracts as were so referred to them by the Board, and reported to the Board the results of their examination, recommending such changes to be made in those books or tracts as they thought desirable; and in no single instance does it appear that the Tract Committee authorized the publication of any work so altered without the express sanction and approval of the Board.

"Of the works thus referred to the Tract Committee, the following eight were altered by the Tract Committee, and with the alterations were submitted to the Board, and were afterwards published by the order of the Board; namely,—

"In the year 1835,

"Country Clergyman's advice to his Parishioners.

"The great importance of a religious Life.

"Companion to the Altar.

"Advice to Young Women on going to Service.

"The Church Catechism broken into Short Questions.

"And in the year 1836,

"The Pious Parishioner Instructed.

"A Companion to the Aged.

"The Christian Monitor.

"They are not aware of any other work having been altered during that time.

"The Tract Committee, having experienced great difficulty in fulfilling the wishes of the Board with respect to the revision of old books and tracts, were anxious to be relieved from this task, which was still urged upon them.

"At length, in March, 1836, they made the following communication to the Board:—

"The Tract Committee regret to be obliged to report, that having endeavoured to the utmost of their power to fulfil the wishes of the Society, as to the correction of passages deemed open to objection in points of doctrine in works already on the Society's Catalogue, they feel themselves under the necessity of declining that part of the office assigned them by the Board.'

"This report was received by the Board.

"At the next Board, April 5th, 1836, the Standing Committee made a report, in which, having referred to the above resolution of the Tract Committee, they use these words:—

"In consequence of this resolution, the Standing Committee think it desirable that the Tract Committee should be requested to direct their attention in future to the providing of new books and tracts, and that the duty of making such corrections in the old ones should revert to the Standing Committee.

"This duty, however, they doubt whether they shall be able to discharge in such a manner as to obviate all objections, or to give universal satisfaction.'

"The Tract Committee, from the time of communicating their resolution to the Board in March, 1836, to the present day, have strictly adhered to that resolution, and have never, except as hereinafter stated, made any alterations of the doctrines, sentiments, or expressions in the work of any deceased author on the Society's Catalogue; nor are they

aware of any such alterations having been made either by the Standing Committee, or otherwise.

"In the year 1841, it having become a matter of notoriety that changes of different kinds had crept into the Society's editions of some works of deceased authors, the Tract Committee and the Standing Committee conferred together upon the subject of providing that the old books and tracts should be faithfully reprinted; and in consequence the following resolution of the Standing Committee was reported to the Tract Committee:—

Feb. 5th, 1841.

"Agreed: that the Tract Committee be requested to take such measures as they may think proper for the careful republication of the old books and tracts on the Society's List, and that they be authorized to employ a competent person or persons to revise them, when new editions are required."

In compliance with this request, the Tract Committee have from time to time engaged the services of competent persons for the express purpose of securing the genuine text of the works of deceased authors already on the Society's Catalogue.

"Under this head may be mentioned 'Nelson's Fasts and Festivals,' and 'Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Golden Grove.'

"In the case of admitting on the Catalogue for the first time the works of deceased authors, the Tract Committee have adhered to the same plan in every case, adopting the edition which they believed to present most faithfully the author's own text.

"Under this head may be specified, among other works, 'Bishop Patrick's Consolatory Discourses,' 'Sutton's Disce Mori, and Disce Vivere,' 'Archdeacon Welchman on the Thirty-nine Articles,' and 'Dean Stanhope on the Epistles and Gospels.'

"The Tract Committee, therefore, so far from having adopted the measures which they are represented to have adopted, have been engaged, to the utmost of their power, in securing the publication, in their original state, of such works as had not been altered with the express sanction of the General Board.

"The Tract Committee desire it to be distinctly understood, that in these observations they do not in anywise advert to those books and tracts which had, at any time previous to their appointment, been altered and adapted

to the use of the Society, and published by direction of the Board.

"The Tract Committee would willingly be relieved from the task of providing for the faithful republication of the works of deceased authors already on the Society's Catalogue; but in the case of admitting such works now for the first time on the Catalogue, they will, as heretofore, take all the care in their power that no work shall be put forth otherwise than as it was published by the author."

This Report having been read,

It was moved by the Rev. Dr. Spry.

"That the Report of the Tract Committee now read be entered on the minutes, and printed in the Monthly Report."

This was seconded by the Dean of Chichester, and carried.

The Secretary stated that the above Report had been laid before the Standing Committee, at their meeting yesterday, and that they had agreed to the following resolution:—

"The Tract Committee having this day communicated to the Standing Committee a report which they intend to present to the Board to-morrow, and which appears to call for some additional information as to circumstances that took place before the appointment of the Tract Committee, it is resolved,—That a statement of facts connected with the alterations made by the Society in the works of deceased authors, be drawn up by the Standing Committee, and submitted to the Board at the General Meeting in April.

"And that this resolution be communicated to the Board to-morrow."

The following memorial was then read to the Meeting:—

"Memorial of certain Members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, resident in the Diocese of Lichfield, addressed to the Chairman and Members of the Society, at their Meeting in Lincoln's Inn Fields, on the fifth day of March, 1844.

"We, the undersigned, having recently seen a publication, called, 'An Appeal to the Members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, containing statements which appear to us very seriously to affect the character of the Institution, beg leave to submit the following observations to the General Meeting.

"It is stated in the 'Appeal,'—and the statement seems borne out by the instances cited,—that changes have been

gradually made in the character of the tracts issued by the Society; and in particular that the works of Old Divines, some of whom were founders of the Institution, or connected with it at an early period, have been in many cases altered,—that various doctrinal and practical statements contained in them have been omitted, and in some instances, language attributed to the authors different from that which they really used.

“We beg to express our earnest hope—and in so doing we believe we are speaking the sentiments of a large majority of members—that the sound and orthodox principles which have so long distinguished this Society, as the instrument of the Church of England in some of her most important functions, may jealously be maintained: and, at the same time, to state our opinion, that if the principles of the Society be compromised or tampered with, the result can only be the promotion of strife and dissatisfaction, and the ultimate disruption of the Institution.

“With regard to the changes made in the books of standard authors, we confess that we are both grieved and surprised—having always supposed that we were reading and distributing the genuine works of the Divines of the English Church.

“We have in vain searched amongst the Rules of the Society for any authority by which the above-named alterations have been made. By the XXXIst Rule ‘the Tract Committee is empowered to place upon the Society’s Catalogue any Book or Tract which shall have been approved by them, and shall afterwards have received the sanction of the Episcopal Referees.’ But it does not appear to us that this Rule gives any power to the Tract Committee for the time being to alter the books and tracts which have long been used for the purposes of the Institution.

“We beg that it may not be supposed that we desire to impute to the present or former members of the Tract Committee any wilful departure from the Rules of the Society; still less do we suppose that men of their high character would lend themselves to any design of misleading the public as to the views of the standard Divines of the English Church. We rather suppose that the practice of making alterations has been suffered gradually to grow up, without consideration of the very serious objections to which it is liable.

“We object to the practice,

“*First*, Because such alterations are disrespectful to the memory of pious and holy men—some of whom were founders of the Institution.

“*Secondly*, Because the language of the old writers is generally better than the new.

“*Thirdly*, Because the alteration of their language, and modification of their sentiments, and omission of their opinions, must have the obvious effect of giving to the numerous readers of the Society’s books a wrong impression of the sentiments entertained by the Bishops and Divines of the English Church.

“*Fourthly*, Because their statements on many subjects (such, for instance, as passages on the Offertory and Festivals which have been omitted in the Society’s editions) would, if fairly presented to the public, have tended to aid the exertions of those Bishops and Clergy, in the present day, who desire to restore the ancient and prescribed usages of the Church.

“*Fifthly*, Because the Clergy and others who use the books of the Society are liable to be misled, and fall into misquotation, by referring to works which are not genuine.

“*Sixthly*, Because being made aware of these defects, we do not feel that we can conscientiously continue to aid in the distribution of books which are not the genuine production of the authors to whom they are attributed.

“We, therefore, respectfully submit, that the books on the Society’s list should be restored to their genuine state, and that in future no alteration of the language and sentiments of deceased writers should be allowed; nor any omission, unless it be found absolutely necessary for the sake of curtailment: and that in such cases the attention of the Episcopal Referees be specially called to the omission, and the usual mark indicating omission be inserted in the text.

“In the meantime, we respectfully request to be informed, what books and tracts on the Society’s list are genuine, and what are not so. And if such information cannot at once be afforded, we beg to suggest that a committee be appointed, who shall make a careful collation of the books of the Society with authentic editions, in order to ascertain to what extent the alterations of the text have been carried.

“It appears to us, that these measures should be adopted without delay, in

order to restore public confidence in the Society, as the instrument for the promotion of true Christian knowledge throughout the land.

"Henry E. J. Howard, Dean of Lichfield.

"T. Gnosall Parr, M.A., Incumbent of St. Michael's, Lichfield, and Secretary of the Lichfield Committee.

"Henry Oldershaw, M.A. Minister of Wall, near Lichfield.

"William Gresley, Prebendary of Lichfield.

"Richard Greene.

"Joseph Taylor, Priest Vicar of Lichfield Cathedral.

"William Villiers, Vicar of Shensstone.

"Francis E. Paget, Rector of Elford."

The Rev. Dr. Spry moved, "That this Memorial be entered upon the minutes, and printed in the Monthly Report."

This was seconded by the Rev. J. Endell Tyler.

The Rev. R. Burgess moved as an amendment, "That the Memorial be referred to the Standing Committee."

E. Moore, Esq., seconded the amendment, which on being put from the chair was negatived.

The original motion was then carried.

MISCELLANEOUS.

[Owing to some inaccuracies in the copy of the following Address, inserted in our last Number, we give it afresh. Its importance requires that it should stand in the pages of the "Christian Remembrancer" in an authentic form.]

"Nov. 1843.

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR REVERENCE,—We, the undersigned Presbyters of the Diocese of Aberdeen, beg leave respectfully to address your Reverence on a subject very deeply interesting to us as Scottish Churchmen.

"We have seen with surprise and deep regret that attempts have recently been made, in more than one Diocese of this Church, either to procure the entire abrogation of Canon XXI., in which the orthodoxy of the Scottish Communion Office is asserted, or otherwise so essentially to modify that Canon as to derogate from the primary authority with which that Office is invested in the Church of Scotland.

"Now we, your Reverence's faithful Presbyters, actuated by the earnest desire to obviate, if possible, any similar attempts—attempts which, we are well assured, will never meet with any sympathy from your Reverence—as well as to strengthen, so far, the hands of those Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of this Church, who desire to maintain the authority and use of the national Office, as recognised and warranted by Canon XXI., beg leave respectfully to lay before your Reverence the following reasons which have prompted us to address

you with this expression of our sentiments:

"I. Although, as your Reverence is aware, more than one of the undersigned Presbyters have availed themselves, from various circumstances, of the permission granted by Canon XXI., and administer according to the usage of England, yet they cordially unite with their brethren who use the national Office, in expressing their decided conviction of the superiority of that Office, inasmuch as therein the great Eucharistic doctrines of the Real Presence and a Commemorative Sacrifice are more fully developed, and by which its identity with the Divine model appointed by our Lord in Holy Scripture is clearly evinced. These characteristics of the Scottish Office have commanded for it the approbation of all Ritualists of orthodox and patristic principles; and, therefore, we prize it, not only as a mark of the integral as well as independent character of the Scottish branch of the Church Catholic, but also as a rich inheritance handed down to us by our fathers in the faith, and therefore to be by us faithfully transmitted to our children, and those who come after us.

"II. We desire to express our dissent from the idea of those who would seem to erect the principle of *Liturgical conformity* as the one great note of union and communion, and would remind them that the Catholic Church in Scotland is not a mere appendage to the Catholic Church in England, but, though unestablished, still a national Church; that

'every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things are done to edifying;' and that in primitive times, almost every diocese had its own particular Liturgy prescribed by its Bishop, and yet, that a more efficient intercommunion was maintained between the several portions of the primitive Church than has been secured to the various branches of the later Church.

"III. Although we are unwilling to contemplate the possibility of the abrogation, or even the remodelling of Canon XXI., yet, in such an event, we should feel it our sacred duty to protest against the sin which, in abandoning the Scottish Office, the relinquishment of such an amount of Catholic truth would involve; for that it *would* involve such a relinquishment, the undersigned cannot escape from the conviction, seeing that the present clamour against the Scottish Office *originated* with individuals who demanded its abolition, not chiefly because it is *expedient* to assimilate ourselves to the sister Church of England, not chiefly because *uniformity* is desirable—but principally and avowedly because, in their eyes, it is deeply tainted with Popish idolatry and superstition.

"IV. In order to guard ourselves against any chance of misconception, we deem it right to declare our conviction, that the Communion Offices of Scotland and England teach the same holy and scriptural truths; both equally remote from the Romish dogma of a *corporeal* presence, and the ultra-Protestant error of a mere *commemoration* in the holy Eucharist. We are satisfied that the distinctive doctrines of the Eucharist are contained in the one Office, by plain implication, obvious inference, and statements more or less explicit; while in the other we see them clearly and broadly enunciated, and without the possibility of heretical perversion. No disciple of

Zwinglius or Hoadley could subscribe to the Scottish Communion Office. It is only when these distinctive doctrines are denied, an opposite and uncatholic sense attempted to be put upon the *English* Office, and the abandonment of the Scottish Office demanded as a *consequence*, that we feel it our duty to resist the repeal of the Canon which recognises that Office, and for the reasons above stated, solemnly to declare that, in our eyes, its relinquishment would be tantamount to an apostasy.

"That your Reverence may long be spared to preside over this diocese, and to the Church whose Primacy you so worthily hold, is the devout prayer of, may it please your Reverence, your Reverence's dutiful and faithful Presbyters,

JOHN CUMMING, Dean.

P. CHEYNE, Presbyter, Aberdeen.

DAVID WILSON, Presb^r, Woodhead.

ARTHUR RANKEN, Presb^r, at Deer.

WILL^m WEBSTER, Presb^r, New Pit-sligo.

WILLIAM ROBERTSON, Presb^r, Old-Meldrum.

CHARLES GRANT, Presb^r, Meikle-folla.

JAMES CHRISTIE, Presbyter, Turriff.

JAMES SMITH, Presbyter, Forgue.

AL. HARPER, Presb^r, Inverury.

ALEXANDER COOPER, Presb^r, Portsoy.

ANDREW RITCHIE, Presbyter.

ALEXANDER BRUCE, Presbyter, Banff.

GEORGE HAGAR, Presbyter, Lonmay.

CHARLES PRESSLEY, Presbyter, Fraserburgh.

A. LOW, Presbyter, Longside.

JOHN B. PRATT, Presbyter, Cruden.

NATH^l GRIEVE, Presb^r, Ellon.

"To the Right Reverend
THE BISHOP OF ABERDEEN."

"I beg to express my hearty concurrence in the above address.

"CHAS. WAGSTAFF, Junior Minister
of St. Andrew's, Aberdeen, and
late Curate of Arundel, Sussex."

THE NEW DIVINITY STATUTE AT OXFORD.

Oxford, March 7, 1844.

THE Statute now pending, which involves certain new regulations on the subject of the B.D. degree, has been re-committed by the Hebdomadal Board, in deference to the most unusually unani-

mous voice of public opinion. We may expect then that one or two of the more obnoxious provisions will be modified or repealed. Under these circumstances, it is better to confine our present attention to the *principle* involved in all that part

of the Statute; and which can not be modified or repealed, without making the whole Statute nugatory. That principle is the obligation, which in due time is to be imposed on all who may desire the B.D. degree, that they shall have passed the examination instituted by the Theological Statute of 1842. Now in a time of such very earnest controversy as the present, when advocates of either side generally consider their opponents not merely to hold *erroneous* opinions, but opinions *inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church of England*, if the examiners under the Statute be honest and sincere men, they *must* make the Theological Examination, more or less, a test of doctrine. They are bound to refuse their testimonial to a candidate, whom they consider to contradict the voice of that Church to which they, in common with him, belong. It follows therefore directly, that the necessary result of passing the Statute in any shape must be, that the Board of Theological Examiners will be final judges of orthodoxy, so far as regards admission to the theological faculty.

Now are we, Members of Convocation, prepared to concede this point? are we prepared to rule, that in course of time no Masters of Arts shall be allowed to take their B. D. degree, or, consequently, in not a few cases, to *retain their fellowships*, whose opinions shall have been considered by the Board of Theological Examiners inconsistent with those of the Church of England?

How are these examiners appointed? Two are appointed by a body of five, or (as it will be in its complete state) a body

of six professors. How do these professors obtain their situation? The Professor of Divinity from—the Crown; the Professor of Hebrew from—the Crown; the Professor of Pastoral Theology from—the Crown; the Professor of Ecclesiastical History from—the Crown; the Professor of Exegetical Theology from—the Hebdomadal Board; the Margaret Professor from—that very faculty of Theology to which it is proposed, in due course of time, to apply this test.

These professors nominate *from their own body* two out of the three Theological Examiners; the third is appointed by—the Vice-Chancellor; submitted to the approval of—this very faculty of Theology again.

The old constitution of the University was, that Convocation was the governing body, and Congregation the body for granting degrees. In two several official documents we have heard lately, that the Vice-Chancellor is the 'Resident Governor,' that the Hebdomadal Board are the "responsible Governors of the University of Oxford," and that they adopt measures "with the assistance of Convocation." And there seems every disposition to make it manifest, that these are very far from accidental and unmeaning expressions. If this Statute should pass in any shape, not the University itself, or its governing body, but the Crown and the Hebdomadal Board are constituted, for the whole faculty of Theology, irresponsible judges, to determine what is, and what is not, the doctrine of the Church of England.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A valued friend is thanked for his information and hints as to the "Brothers of the Christian Doctrine." We hope to pursue the subject: indeed we are so firmly convinced that all that is commonly understood by the term "national education," is no better than a disguised anti-christianism; that we hail anything like an indication, however faint, of a return to discharging *all* works of evangelical love by those commissioned in the Church.

The same feelings lead us to urge several correspondents and well-wishers to the proposed revival of Orders of Mercy, to think seriously of a scheme—such as a private conference—by which, having now talked and written enough, we may begin to act. "Action—action—action" must be at once our consolation and watchword: it is the sole reality.

S. C. overstates the force of our observation, if he thought that the writer of the article on the American Church intended to convey a dogmatic assertion that consecration by a single Bishop was *ipso facto* invalid. Such cases must be judged simply by their own merits; and a distinction must be drawn as to the degree of necessity in each. In case of all but general apostasy, for example, it would be harsh to say that such a consecration were even uncanonical. However, we refer those interested in the inquiry both to Palmer and Bingham—and to Bellarmine.